CROZER QUARTERLY

Volume XXII JULY, 1945 Number 3

# THE HUMANITIES AND THE CURRICULA

A. C. REID
Wake Forest College

A PRIMARY obligation of a young Christian is to become a cultured gentleman. An essential objective of a church-related college or a seminary is the promotion of culture. The influence of an educational institution largely depends upon the nature of its academic standards and the quality of the work done in its classrooms where the white heat of speculation reduces facts and opinions to ideas and convictions.

The curricula greatly influence both the type and the quality of classroom work. The present calamity affecting the world is the symptom of an educational malady which demands that we rethink the content, methods, and influences of education. The subtle academic attack upon personality is one of the gravest dangers in the world today. It is therefore imperative that we who are interested in education, especially as related to principles of righteousness and an adequate Christian leadership, examine the curricula of church-related institutions, in order to discover their nature and influence with respect to that culture which is invaluable to the successful promotion of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

This paper deals briefly with only two aspects of existing educational conditions, the pragmatic nature of the curricula and the vital rôle of the humanities. The curricula are here defined as institutional devices employed to impart academic subjects and to encourage mental discipline, while the humanities are those institutional resources which are conducive to elemental thought and enlightened freedom.

## THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE CURRICULA

The vast physical equipment, the accessibility of educational institutions, the large enrollments in normal times, scientific achievements, and other such educational accomplishments deserve recognition and approval. There are, however, serious weaknesses that demand attention.

For example, modern education is unduly specialized. Preparatory schools and institutions of higher learning, both secular and sectarian, yielding to popular trends and demands, have established departments and schools which represent almost every field of interest and which encourage

premature specialization. The existing pragmatic mood has led numerous schools and departments—not infrequently theological institutions—into a maze where foundational studies are lost and the basic purpose of education is ignored. Under the questionable banner of progress, the classics, mathematics, philosophy, theology, and other subjects which enlarge thought, discipline the mind and develop a love of the worth-while are being supplanted by "practical" courses of study, no matter how superficial the latter may be. The condition is so grave that several learned societies in this country recognize the perilous discrimination against the humanities by the public, by political agencies, and by ambitious, opportunistic administrators and professors.

An examination of the catalogues of colleges of liberal arts, professional schools, and theological institutions reveals a disturbing emphasis upon methods and techniques. One finds the curricula not only highly professionalized, but also cluttered with courses designed to teach one how to teach, how to conduct church socials, how to play golf, and how to hike. One school places almost no emphasis upon psychology, as such, and offers approximately fourteen courses in applied psychology. A distinguished university recently awarded ten different types of the bachelor's degree.

The prevailing opinion that education should devote itself primarily to technical and professional training is dangerous. Undue specialization, wherever it occurs, restricts interest, appreciation, and sympathy, and thus breeds ignorance, prejudice, and inhumanity. A provincial-minded specialist, whatever his field, may insist upon rules and beliefs which are insufferable to freedom, ethics, and faith. In this relation Albert Schweitzer writes: "In all professions, most clearly perhaps in the pursuit of science, we can recognize the spiritual danger with which specialization threatens not only individuals, but the spiritual life of the community. It is also noticeable that education is carried on now by teachers who have not a wide enough outlook to make their scholars understand the interconnection of the individual sciences, and to be able to give them a mental horizon as wide as it should be." Warning that education must be rescued from the limitations of strict specialization, Charles Hubbard Judd says that a "specialist in theology can be as narrow-minded as a specialist in auto-mechanics, and he can add to his narrowness an indefinable pride of class which makes him a menace to community life."

Moreover, the present purpose of education is excessively pragmatic. It is unduly characterized by empiricism, opportunism, and devotion to immediate objectives. It thus implies that the end of education is "cash values." Marching under the standard of Charles Peirce, it demands that ideas be made clear, however superficial the ideas and irrespective of

how many foundational beliefs such intellectual myopia would ignore. Following Francis Bacon, it insists that the millennium can be had through science and technology. Yielding to the seductive William James, it discards metaphysics for edible pudding, "looking away from first things, principles, 'categories,' supposed necessities; and . . . looking toward last things, fruits, consequences, facts."

It should be realized that when principles are discredited and pragmatic results become the criteria of truth, it is easy for low values to multiply and for idealism to become imperiled by the unscrupulous and radical Protagorean-Machiavellian-Nietzschean-Hitlerian ideology.

Furthermore, pragmatic education is myopic. Such nearsightedness substitutes expediency for right, *mores* for ethical principles, techniques for thought, organizations for fundamental convictions, and social service for God. And it rarely, if ever, permits one to see that such so-called practical education is a compromise with mediocrity and, ultimately, highly impractical. In this relation Socrates wisely cautions that there is danger of "breaking the large vessel in learning to make pots." And Schweitzer wisely warns that "when the virgin forest is cut down, brushwood springs up where the big trees were formerly." A great, creative, intellectual superstructure cannot rise upon a small foundation of restricted specialization. For illustration, and by way of contrast, what educational techniques can produce Wordsworth's *Intimations,* Shakespeare's *Hamlet,* Spinoza's *Ethica,* Plato's *Republic,* or John's Gospel?

There is, of course, a place for handicrafts, textiles, domestic arts, teachers' colleges, and other professional schools. But the primary function of a college is not the teaching of techniques for quick success, but rather the promotion of mental growth, high idealism, and those cultural values which through the centuries have contributed to the enlightenment of mind, the increase of learning, creative thought, and devotion to truth. The present emphasis upon practical needs has, nevertheless, produced a vicious, spurious, and, often, putrescent realism which obscures man's basic attributes and degrades him to the level of the animal. Moreover, we use the microscope, the comptometer, the slide rule, and aptitude tests as if human life and spirit and truth were reducible to the category of things. One can no more find truth in instruments, methods, and standards of professional efficiency, as such, than Elijah found God in the wind, the earthquake, and the fire.

Pragmatic education is also largely provincial. It restricts man's interests to the utilitarian, the transient, and the immediate. Its product, Theodore Meyer Greene caustically suggests, resembles an individual who experiences only unrelated sensations, or simple perceptions, or social conventions, or mere empirical thought. As Reinhold Niebuhr reminds us,

however, the mature mind appropriates the wisdom of the past through history and memory, understands the present through observation and reason, and anticipates the future through imagination and knowledge of social trends. The mature mind, Plato urges, is capable of grasping an idea of the world as a whole and achieving awareness of the totality of reality by having his eyes fixed upon truth. It appears, however, that education now can better be characterized by the words *intellectual immaturity.* Some of our pontificating experts who insist upon the superiority of practical education and encourage students to avoid philosophy and the classics might with profit ponder Odysseus' words to Eurymachus: "You are very proud and your temper is disdainful; no doubt you seem a great man and mighty, because you mix with few and they are of little worth."

Furthermore, pragmatic educational interests, as such, are ultimately foundationless. F. C. S. Schiller says, for illustration, that anyone who "prefers to remain within the bounds of actual knowledge is entitled to refrain from pledging himself to a metaphysic." Concerning the one who discredits faith in truth Plato long ago remarked: "Good he pronounces to be that in which the beast delights and evil to be that which he dislikes; and he can give no other account of them except that the just and noble are the necessary, having never himself seen, and having no power of explaining to others the nature of either, or the difference between them, which is immense. By heaven, would not such a one be a rare educator?" Education which thus discredits metaphysics cannot employ the sane criteria of permanence, value, and universality. Sophists, both ancient and modern, presume to reduce truth to opinion. The *homo mensura* tenet restricts knowledge to opinion, and therefore is either agnostic about or denies knowledge of ultimates. It is easy to understand that out of such a conception are born fears, skepticism, and futility which remind one of Milton's incestuous progeny of Satan, Sin, and Death, which

> Afresh with constant terrours vex me round,
> That rest or intermission none I find.

This apostasy about man, faith, and God, growing out of the plausible half-truth of practical education, has produced what Henry Sloane Coffin calls certain thinkers who, "still claiming the Christian name, gave up belief in God as the Lord of the universe, and reduced him to the spirit of good-will in humanity." It has so robbed man of his faith and idealism, his truth and righteousness, that Schweitzer is amply justified when he says that the "modern man has no longer any self-confidence at all. Behind a self-confident exterior he conceals a great inward lack of confidence. In spite of his great capacity in material matters he is an altogether stunted being. . . ." Or again: "For three or four decades they succeeded in

deceiving themselves and others with this supposedly creative and inspiring illusion. . . . Since that time the ethical ideas on which civilization rests have been wandering about the world, poverty-stricken and homeless."

After all, the underlying problem in life is ultimately that of character. One's body, mind, spirit, and work are involved. The problem of character lies in the realm of honesty, sincerity, wisdom, loyalty, reliability, and kindness. But we can have no sound character, no substantial ethics, and no genuine religion so long as practical objectives, superficial interests, and a foundationless philosophy of education and of life are predominant.

## The Humanities

The humanities are those influences which aid man in attaining enlightened freedom and justifiable dignity. These virtues are achieved through the proper cultivation of information, speculation, loyalty to ideals, respect for man's humanity, and an intelligent faith commensurate with man's spiritual nature. The humanities, in general, acclaim man's preeminence in time, place, and value over the rest of creation, and inspire him to have dominion. Man's humanity, therefore, constitutes his capacity to achieve freedom; the humanities promote the intelligent development and manly expression of his humanity or essential nature.

There are at least six modes of development and expression which the humanities encourage.

First, the humanities stimulate and direct the capacities for creative thought. Man has more than one birthday. There are times of mental awakening, when man enters a new world, when his intellectual horizon becomes enlarged, and when his spiritual perspective becomes broader. Some of us are reborn when we read the winged words of Homer, the idealistic philosophy of Plato, the *Ethica* of Spinoza, the divine epics of Vergil and Dante. Some of us have birthdays when we listen to Kreisler and Paderewski and Toscanini, and look upon great works of art. Some of us rise on the steppingstones of our youthful selves to higher things when an eloquent scholar lectures in history; for, whether or not we understand all, we know something great has passed by. Some of us enter into a new life when we read the Psalms, Isaiah, John, and Paul.

Sometimes these awakenings come when the intellect is exercised on difficult and fundamental problems. The great never appears easily or from mediocrity; nothing worth-while is easy. But when one sincerely works hard and persistently at vital problems, he grows in the direction of truth. By and large, those people who have contributed to creative thought have learned what others have thought and have done, and have themselves grappled tenaciously with deep problems with the suffering and hope of a

Jacob wrestling with the angel. Such men may justly be called the world's great awakeners.

Moreover, one thus reborn into the domain of truth will not be content to live on the level of mediocrity. He will not again be a strict conformist. He is a person who will stand for basic convictions against the combined influence of mankind. Like Heraclitus, he will not compromise in palaces or temples. Like Socrates, his only fear will be that he may do an unrighteous or unholy thing. Like Epictetus, his spirit will be free, although his body may be tortured. Like Roger Williams, who in the dead of winter went to the smoky huts of the Indians rather than live in comfortable agreement with opponents of religious liberty, he will strive to establish, preserve, and enhance our elemental liberties.

Second, the humanities facilitate achievement of an intellectual maturity which involves the fulfillment of the highest possibilities of the mind.

Some educationalists insist that there should be no difficult or uninteresting tasks, and that the classroom should be characterized by pleasantness arising from activities which do not disturb. They, like children in the market place, cry that students should not be troubled by perplexing and agitating major problems related to life, philosophy, and religion, just as if an unexamined life were fit for a man to live. Such an attitude is a travesty upon education, a burlesque upon human life, a stumbling block to religion. It is a cardinal sin to implant mediocre concepts of man's nature, capacity, and obligations, and thus to poison life with inferiority.

Professor Youtz, of Oberlin, wisely urges that the main business of life is the acquisition of personal worth; that the main business of education is elemental thought about life's true and higher values; and that the "central aim of a liberal education of youth should be the production of spiritually vitalized persons." There will be, however, but scanty elemental thought about life and but little intelligent spiritual revitalization until man undertakes to solve problems worthy of the dignity of man and becomes concerned with vital spiritual realities. Before intellectual maturity can be attained, the inner sanctuary of one's life must be transformed. Such a transformation unifies and reorients one's mind, and develops genuine appreciation of life and its highest values. Spiritual maturity does not occur in a life restricted to things, to the pleasant, the easy, the commonplace, or to one's self only. The vision of the real causes one to lose sight of the trivial, the provincial, and the selfish.

Third, the humanities help to create and to maintain dependable character. It is not the part of a man nor is it in conformity with the dignity of a man to be shaken as a reed by every passing wind. Character embraces habits of work, enlightenment, and valid convictions. The studies and the

spirit here designated as humanities demand years of persistent labor for their mastery. The study of mathematics, the classics, history, and philosophy encourages industry, sincerity, and profound thought. The humanities lead one to loathe lethargy, insincerity, and superficiality. Moreover, they provoke loyalty; for when one knows the true, the beautiful, and the good, he will not desert them for the unreal, the cheap, and the tawdry; and he will live to commit himself to something greater than himself.

Such an attitude does not come from an education embracing trickery, cleverness, and short cuts, because such evils grow out of low conceptions of life and its relations. It does not spring from conditions of thought that degrade man's respect for himself, or from ideologies designed to supplant God. As is so clearly demonstrated in Germany today, when human spirits become enamoured of some man-thing or man-god, grave consequences follow. But when a Bruno and a Huss die and a Grenfell and a Livingstone labor, light eternal is reflected from their solid characters. As Plato shows, the just man's character consists of an inner structure of beams and bolts which enables him to withstand everything that is hard and disturbing, and through this strength to show forth manhood at its best.

Fourth, the humanities promote the essential freedom of the human spirit. There are now times when one wonders if the last stand of human freedom is not being made. Loyalties to cults, to organizations, and to political forces and pandering for position, doles, and luxuries now bring freedom under constant attack. For illustration, public demands and formal education often lead us to write, to teach, and to preach in view of reputation, conventions, and finances.

The nature of freedom needs to be made clear. John Alexander Mackay is right when he says that freedom "means a great deal more than freedom to obtain an education, freedom from inhuman treatment, freedom to assume responsibility according to one's capacity, freedom from the necessity of believing or worshipping in opposition to one's conscience. . . . One might enjoy all of these liberties to the full without being a free man. . . . True freedom is positive in character . . . it is the freedom that is born when personality in its wholeness dedicates itself to the pursuit of good. It is freedom in the truth. . . . Perfect human freedom is captivity to the divine."

Now freedom is not a gift; it is the laurel of a real conquest. Choice cannot be exercised indiscriminately. It must be cultivated by the acquisition and use of information and the wise interpretation and application of knowledge. The humanities, through the development and integration of the whole man, undertake to lead man to discover and apprehend truth —truth which is divine and which imparts an inner freedom to him who possesses it.

Economic freedom, political freedom, and spiritual freedom do not conflict, for they are harmoniously related. "Civilization," says Schweitzer, "presupposes free men, for only by free men can it be thought and brought to realization." It was through a spirit of freedom that the Greek enlightenment arose, that the culture of the Renaissance flourished, that democracy was born, and that religious liberty was attained. It is thus through freedom that bold and constructive pioneering becomes possible, for under such a condition one's soul, no longer entangled in organizations or enslaved by despots, dares to venture toward truth.

The humanities, therefore, in their several ways exalt the truth that leads to freedom and dignity. They point beyond mere information, accumulated data, and practical values toward reality. President Hutchins tersely states the matter thus: "The aim of education is wisdom. Wisdom is knowledge of principles and causes. Metaphysics deals with the highest principles and causes. Therefore metaphysics is the highest wisdom." He thus shows that freedom has its roots, its growth, and its fruits in eternal truth. His is another way of emphasizing the Master's pronouncement, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Fifth, the humanities encourage the increase of the wisdom of the race. They do this in two ways: first, by appropriating the accumulated wisdom of the past; and second, by bold adventure into the unknown.

In the field of thought the present is the child of the past. There is no purely original thought, for thought grows out of the past. The humanities persistently call attention to the great masters and bid us walk in fellowship with them. For illustration, the humanities introduce us, in literature, to Homer, Æschylus, Euripides, Aristophanes, Vergil, Dante, Shakespeare, Robert Browning; in art, to Phidias, Ictinus, Michelangelo, da Vinci, and Rembrandt; in philosophy, to Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Spinoza, and Hegel; in religion, to Moses, Paul, St. Francis, Augustine, Wesley, and, above all others, Jesus. No one can rightly claim to be cultured until he has made such masters his friends and caught their spirit. Our spiritual inheritance from them is as indispensable as it is glorious.

And having caught their spirit one becomes bold. He is no longer held by the established boundaries of creeds, dogmas, and traditions. Having associated with creative pioneers, one himself desires to pioneer. Like Abraham, he seeks a new area of God's garden; like Bruno, he yearns to hear the music of the spheres; like Paul, he longs to become a bond servant of truth; like Schweitzer, he heeds the still, sad voice of human need.

Sixth, the humanities promote graciousness. The best single evidence of a man's culture is his graciousness. A cultured gentleman possesses unaffected refinement and commanding dignity, observes the amenities, is

courtly, serene, and highly sensitive to human needs and values. The social graces—refinement, courtesy, elegance, gentility—grow out of an inner dignity, respect, and refinement. They do not spring from intellectual mediocrity or from provincial conceptions of life. They arise in one's recognition of man's preëminence over the rest of creation, of his inherent worth, of his high place in the universe, and of his relation to God.

Man's graciousness grows in proportion to the increase of his enlightenment. When he perceives reality, his "soul rejoices and is made glad," and the secondary things, even life and death, do not so concern him as do truth, freedom, and personal obligation. Like Marcus Aurelius, he comprehends himself in relation to the universe and regards himself as a citizen of the world. Like Socrates, he understands that no evil can befall a good man either in this life or the next. Like John, he is steadfast and unmovable, for he believes that truth gives men "power to become the sons of God."

The humanities, therefore, assist one to acquire such wisdom and such refinement of feeling that his humanity, at its best and fullest, will flow freely and graciously as becomes a life that is fit for a man to live. I have never known a great man who was uncivil. Tennyson correctly says, "The greater man, the greater courtesy."

It is supreme folly, therefore, to delude ourselves longer with blind optimism, springing from the half-truth of an unduly specialized, provincial, foundationless pragmatic education. This is perhaps the most fateful hour within the last thousand years. The present catastrophe is the result of a malady in the human mind and spirit. Without intellectual enlightenment and spiritual awakening there is no hope of saving our world from ruin and disintegration. Recovery will occur only if and when enlightened freedom and spiritual independence prevail.

# WHY NOT BE INTELLIGENT TOO?

MILTON C. WESTPHAL
Lansdowne Baptist Church, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania

MANY years ago in a penetrating article published in the *Hibbert Journal,* John Erskine offered the observation that the Anglo-Saxon mind exhibits a tendency to glorify the virtues of courage and discipline, and to ascribe a lesser glory to intelligence. "Toll for the brave," sings the poet for those who went down in the *Royal George.* "But," says Erskine, "he might have more accurately sung, 'Toll for the stupid.' For in order to clean the hull, brave Kempenfelt and his eight hundred heroes took the serious risk of laying the vessel well over on its side while most of the crew were below. Having made so stupid a blunder, they all died bravely, and our memory passes easily over the lack of the virtue of intelligence which we never did think very much of anyway."

Perhaps it is that same Anglo-Saxon prejudice in favor of morality at the expense of intelligence which can explain how John Milton, with a mind of colossal magnitude, could in his *Paradise Lost* attribute intelligence of the highest order to the devil and at the same time make God so illogical, heartless, and dull. The Greek was a sight more aware of the importance of intelligence than the Anglo-Saxon has shown himself to be, at least according to one wit, who said he would give a king's ransom for a book review on *The Vicar of Wakefield* as a certain Socrates of ancient Athens would do the job. Apparently Milton's familiarity with the literature of the Greek classicists did not prevent him from thinking of God as being too good to be smart.

It may be, however, that Mr. Erskine is being unfair to the Anglo-Saxon in high lighting his scant regard for intelligence where morality is concerned. Perhaps the Jewish-Christian inheritance which the devout Anglo-Saxon cherishes has in no small way been responsible for his bias. In ancient Israel the liberated thinker never quite made the grade with the orthodox. The power to interpret signs and oracles was the special province of the priest. The ability to hear the voice of Jehovah was attributed to the prophet. But the faculty of self-determination and of devising practical measures for living was grudingly conceded to the wise man as a secular and therefore a questionable accomplishment. Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, each in turn accuse the wise man of conceit and immorality, thereby betraying their impatience with the independent thinkers who did not concur in their conclusions.

According to the author of Proverbs (8:30) God took pleasure in wisdom even before he embarked upon the stupendous task of creation.

But the neglect of the so-called wisdom literature of the Old Testament may only serve to illustrate the fact that popular religion has too often preferred the mouthings of Balaam's ass to the less dramatic judgments of reasonable men.

With that disarming candor which always characterizes the honest doubts of a thoroughly sincere thinker, C. E. M. Joad in his *God and Evil* has bluntly said, "It is the anti-intellectual bias of Jesus that I personally found most disquieting. He abuses men of learning, denounces the critical attitude in order to throw into favourable relief that of unquestioning acceptance, and tells people that it is only if they become as little children, and therefore, as innocent and, presumably, as ignorant as little children, that they can hope to understand Him and be saved." [1]

Needless to say, most of us would differ sharply with Mr. Joad in his interpretation of Jesus' words in the passage referred to, but we must agree with him when he says further, "This attitude has served as a cue for Jesus's followers, a cue which St. Paul was all too ready to take—'The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.' 'For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.'" "O course," continues Joad, "it may be said that the 'wise' were very far from being wise, and [Paul's allusion to] the 'science, falsely so-called" is not science at all, but is Gnosticism." ". . . when we consider the attitude of the Church to independent learning throughout the ages, the endeavours of the mediæval Church to suppress free scientific enquiry, the hostility of the nineteenth-century Church to the great discoveries of contemporary biologists, it is difficult to avoid the view that these are expressions of the same attitude of mind as that which Paul brings to the denunciation of the Gnostics." [2]

Since the turn of our present century many doughty warriors have worn themselves to a frazzle in the vain effort to lay the stubborn ghost of Charles Darwin for the sake of defending the faith. And it may be conjectured that if Darwin was permitted to linger in purgatory until the dramatic arrival of William Jennings Bryan, then the archheretic was certainly sent packing to where he justly belonged by the eloquent denunciations of the silver-tongued champion of orthodoxy.

Indeed, if we may judge by the plaudits of the emotionally redeemed, when some ordained spellbinder consigns all intellectuals to the lake of fire, then God and reason are not on good terms with each other. The person of full mind must perforce have a starved heart. And by the same token, the person with a stout heart must necessarily have a weak head. Perhaps Charles Kingsley was standing in line with the tradition of

[1] C. E. M. Joad, *God and Evil*, p. 307.
[2] *Ibid.*

popular Christianity when he advised, "Be good, sweet maid, and let who can be clever." As though goodness and intelligence were diametrically opposed to each other. All of which controverts my thesis that it is possible to please God and still be intelligent.

But perhaps to try to please God by being intelligent is after all a larger order than even the best of us finds it possible to fill. It is only trite to observe that in all human behaviour intellect plays a rôle subordinate to that of the blind and irrational emotions. Rational living fails to be achieved, not because of a lack of intelligence, but because of the dominance of irrational impulses over the intellect.

The poet-clergyman, John Donne, who lived in the time of James I, has naïvely portrayed for us the doings of a saint's mind.

> I throw myself down in my chamber, and I call in, and invite God, and his angels thither, and when they are there, I neglect God and his Angels, for the noise of a fly, for the rattling of a coach, for the whining of a door. I talk on, in the same posture of praying; eyes lifted up; knees bowed down; as though I prayed to God; and if God, or his Angels should ask me, when I thought last of God in that prayer, I cannot tell. Sometimes I find that I had forgot what I was about, but when I began to forget it, I cannot tell. A memory of yesterday's pleasures, a fear of to-morrow's dangers, a straw under my knee, a noise in mine ear, a light in mine eye, an anything, a nothing, a fancy, a chimera in my brain troubles me in my prayer.[3]

That John Donne did a better job of thinking when he was not praying, those who have studied his poetry are eager to admit; and so do we. But it is true that only the rarest of thinkers employ their intellects as instruments for adaptation to new situations without being hampered by persistent tendencies to self-magnification and self-justification. The cultural lag which obtains in our own day even among the most gifted of thinkers in all fields of endeavor is appallingly evident. Why, for example, do we adhere to political and economic nationalism in a world in which nations have become more interdependent economically than ever before? Why do we cling to an outworn hierarchy of values in which economic gain derived from producing goods is supreme, although most of these goods are produced by machines and routine activities while the fundamental problems of peaceful social life are still unsolved? Or again, why do the great nations still believe in war as a means of settling conflicting interests and diverting discontent, in an age in which war has become so destructive and expensive that even the victor is defeated?

All these stupidities constitute a disharmony between habitual human attitudes and existing conditions. Their elimination calls for the kind of intelligence which can push the emotions to renounce earlier gratifica-

[3] Quoted by Robert Lynd, *The Art of Letters*, pp. 46-47.

tions and accept new and more independent satisfactions in order to grow up.

What is true of man's lack of rational procedure in the ordering of his political, social, and economic life is preëminently true in the realm of his religious life. As Durant Drake has pointed out, "The ideas learned in childhood, the beliefs of parents and friends, the mental conceptions of the formative years, are usually those that the mature man champions. Few can rise above their early environment; unconsciously it colors and directs their thought, and stamps itself ineradicably upon their minds. . . . Rare is the man who is willing to question old beliefs and look critically at his faith."[4]

To be sure, we sometimes find ourselves changing our minds without resistance or heavy emotion, but if we are told we are wrong, we resent the imputation and harden our hearts. We are incredibly heedless in the formation of our beliefs, but find ourselves filled with an illicit passion for them when anybody proposes to rid us of their companionship. It is only too evident that it is not the ideas themselves that are dear to us, but rather our self-esteem which is threatened. The result is that most of our so-called reasoning consists in finding arguments for going on believing as we already do. Our good reasons ordinarily have no value in promoting honest enlightenment, because at bottom they are the result of personal preference or prejudice, and not of an honest desire to seek or accept new knowledge.

Thousands of argumentative works have been written to vent a grudge. If a history of theology could be written in terms of the grouches, wounded pride, or aversions which have given would-be theologians impetus, it would be a far more instructive treatise than the usual treatments which only serve to drive the student nearer to intellectual suicide.

Of course, in passing, it is only fair to observe that sometimes resentment leads to great achievement. For example, when John Milton wrote his treatise on divorce it was the result of his troubles with his seventeen-year-old wife, and when he was accused of being the leading spirit in a new sect styled the "Divorcers," he grew madder still and wrote his *Arcopagitica* to prove his right to say what he saw fit, and incidentally to establish the advantage of a free press in the promotion of truth. But when it comes to theological peeves, the resulting manuscript too often falls short of such classical achievement.

Despite the ancient adage, it is never folly to be wise. If, as Dean Sperry has said, "Religion has allowed itself in these recent years to be thrown far too much upon the defensive, as being an intellectual and moral adventure in excess of anything that reason can countenance," then it is

[4] Durant Drake, *Shall We Stand by the Church?* pp. 64-65.

high time that we attempted valiantly to please God by being candidly intelligent.

The pathetic picture of an Anglican clergyman drawn by Mr. Joad can give us pause, even if we are safe within the nonconformist fold. "When introduced to one [*sc.* a clergyman of the Anglican Church], I experience a curious mixture of feelings. In the first place, there is pity, pity because the church of the clergyman is so very empty, because he habitually preaches to bare pews, or to pews filled with the very old, with the very young, with the uneducated and the stupid . . . pity, because the poor man is so rarely able to give a clear account of his beliefs; because he has been so bewildered by Darwin and Einstein and science generally; because I know that if he were to submit his beliefs to the test of dialectical discussion, any philosopher who knew his business could tie him into knots in five minutes. . . ." [5]

These biting words cannot be flung aside as caricature. We may feel very sure that they do not fit us in the least, but we all know at least a couple of "divines" who answer the description. To the so-called orthodox these sainted parsons offer the "balm of Gilead." Elderly folk who have leaned hard and long on their particular form of faith, and to whom the loss of it would be a bitter and demoralizing experience, are soothingly served by such gentlemen of the cloth, but the church is not. To take great care lest the older and better paying members of the congregation be upset by forthright thinking in the light of modern science and scholarship is to alienate the younger and better educated generation whose tithes will be needed to pay off the church mortgage when the saints have been embalmed physically as well as spiritually.

Recently Dr. William Dock, a Cornell pathologist, challenged the prevalent practice of putting patients to bed, except in cases of absolute necessity. His paper, based upon years of scientific observation and experiment, caused a stir in the medical fraternity, but they did not call for the revoking of his license. Instead they sponsored a series of clinical experiments to learn whether his findings were worthy of incorporation in medical practice. Such intelligent open-mindedness is the secret of the remarkable advances made by medicine during the past quarter of a century. If Dr. Dock had been a theologian, the treatment he received would have been somewhat different.

What a pity that Sophia, in whom Jehovah daily took delight, has never been canonized! Had that come to pass it might have been respectable to please God and be intelligent too.

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. 337.

# A SUMERIAN "PARADISE" MYTH

SAMUEL NOAH KRAMER

**University Museum, University of Pennsylvania**

One of the least expected, and from the point of view of man's cultural history, one of the most revealing, discoveries of Near Eastern archæology, is that of the Sumerians and their civilization. What the archæologists who first began excavating in Iraq some hundred years ago looked for was primarily the buried remains of Assyria and Babylonia. For these civilizations they had at their disposal considerable biblical, classical, and postclassical sources, a rich and unbroken tradition which spurred their search and intensified their efforts. But of Sumer and the Sumerians they had not an inkling. There was no recognizable trace either of the land or of its people in the entire literature available to the western scholar; the very name Sumer had been erased from the mind and memory of man for over two thousand years. How different matters stand today! As a result of the numerous and varied remains yielded by the ancient sites, the Sumerians have now become one of the best-known peoples of the ancient Near East. Their material remains—statues and steles, columns and bricks, arms and weapons, harps and lyres, pots and vases, jewels and ornaments, not to mention thousands of stamp and cylinder seals—can be seen on display in several of the more important museums here and abroad. Clay tablets by the tens of thousands—literally so—inscribed with the Sumerian business and economic documents, crowd the tablet collections of various museums; their contents reveal the ethnic layers, the social structure, and the administrative organization of ancient Sumer. As for the more spiritual aspects of Sumerian culture—and here is where archæology, because of its very nature, is usually least productive—we now have a vast and varied group of Sumerian literary tablets and fragments the contents of which, when finally reconstructed and translated, will furnish an excellent cross section of Sumerian literature, and provide us with the basic source material for their religious, moral, and philosophical concepts. It is not inapt, therefore, that the entire culture complex of Western Asia, from the middle of the fourth to the beginning of the second millennium B.C., has been designated as Sumeric.

Now perhaps the major factor responsible for the growth and spread of the Sumerian civilization was the development of the cuneiform system of writing into a vital and effective instrument of communication. This contribution proved to be a milestone in the history of civilization. Materially, it laid the foundations for a marked advance in the economic, legal, and administrative structure of the Sumerian social organization.

Spiritually, it led to a marked creative productivity in the field of literature. For the Sumerian poets, no longer dependent on barren memory and slavish oral tradition, were now in a position to evolve their religious and intellectual concepts more slowly, but more profoundly, within the elastic and enduring framework of the written literary form. So outstanding was this development, and so inspiring to the surrounding peoples, that the more advanced among them were led to borrow the cuneiform script and to adapt it, in spite of the numerous difficulties involved, to their own tongues. The study of the Sumerian language, script, and literature, therefore, constituted a basic and most important discipline in the scribal schools of the Near East long after the Sumerians had become extinct as a political unit. As a consequence, the influence of Sumerian literature pervaded the entire Near East, and through the Greek and Hebrew cultural traditions has contributed many a thread to the spiritual fabric of the modern civilized world.

It is highly probable that the invention of writing in Sumer came as a result of the expanding economic and administrative needs of the growing urban communities. For as early as 3000 B.C. we find crude pictographic clay tablets inscribed with the oldest bits of economic and administrative memoranda known to man. But it took centuries to develop the system of writing from its early immature stage with its huge number of ideographic and pictographic signs to the fully evolved cuneiform script consisting of a relatively small number of highly conventionalized signs of purely syllabic character. Indeed it was not until the second half of the third millennium that the technique of writing had become sufficiently flexible and plastic to express without difficulty the more complicated historical and literary composition. And there is little doubt that in the period from approximately 2500 to 2000 B.C. the Sumerian men of letters actually wrote down on clay tablets, prisms, and cylinders, in their now mature cuneiform script, many of their literary creations, some of which may until then have been current in oral form only.

However, for one reason or another, only a few literary documents from this earlier period have been excavated to date, although this same period has yielded tens of thousands of economic and administrative tablets and hundreds of votive inscriptions. It is not until we come to the first half of the second millennium that we actually find a large and unique group of Sumerian belles-lettres. From the period immediately following the collapse of the third dynasty of Ur, the period which, according to the very latest and very lowest chronology yet proposed, ranges from approximately 1960 to 1550 B.C., we find scattered in our museums in this country and abroad more than three thousand tablets and fragments inscribed with Sumerian literary compositions. The documents range in size from large

ten-column clay tablets inscribed with hundreds of compactly written lines of text, to tiny fragments containing no more than a few broken lines. As for the compositions inscribed on these tablets and fragments, they run into the hundreds, and vary in length from myths of more than eight hundred lines to brief hymns of no more than twenty lines. And from the point of view of form as well as of content they display a variety of type and genre which, considering the age involved, is as startling as it is revealing. Here in Sumer, a good millennium before the Hebrews wrote down much of their Bible, or the Greeks their *Iliad* and *Odyssey,* we find a rich, mature literature already developed—literature, that is, in the restricted sense of belles-lettres—consisting of such diverse literary kinds as epic tales and myths, hymns and laments, as well as a many-sided group of "wisdom" compositions, including proverbs, fables, and other didactic types.

Some adequate idea of the scope and quantity of Sumerian literature may be obtained from the contents of two small literary catalogues compiled by the ancient Sumerian scribes themselves. Since in the course of the first half of the second millennium B.C. a large number of literary compositions of all types and sizes, inscribed on clay tablets and prisms of all shapes and dimensions, were current in Sumer, some of the scribes in charge of the temple or palace "tablet houses" found it necessary to list the names of this or that group of documents for purposes of reference, or for any of the other needs related to their storing and filing. Two such catalogues are now in our possession. One was excavated in Nippur among the hundreds of the literary tablets excavated by the University of Pennsylvania from its temple library, and is now in the University Museum. The other is of uncertain provenience; it came to the Louvre through the hands of a dealer, but to judge from the script, it may have been written by the very same scribe who compiled our Nippur catalogue. Between them, these two catalogues list the titles of eighty-seven Sumerian literary compositions. The text of at least twenty-eight of these can now be restored wholly or in part from the tablets inscribed by this very same scribe, or by his more or less contemporary colleagues. Indeed, there is little doubt that a good many more of the remaining compositions listed in the two catalogues can now be restored, at least in part, from the contemporary tablets. But since according to the Sumerian cataloguing system the title of a composition consists regularly of the first part of its first line, there is no way of identifying the titles of those compositions whose texts we have in large part but whose first lines are destroyed. On the other hand, we have many a composition on our literary tablets the title of which is not listed in either of the two catalogues. This only proves what in any case was quite obvious, that the list in the two catalogues

contains only a fraction of the compositions current at the time in the libraries or "tablet houses" of Sumer.

To return to the contents of our Sumerian belles-lettres, their significance is threefold. As literary products ranking well up among the æsthetic creations of civilized man, they represent a precious and impressive addition to world literature. As mirrors reflecting the intellectual and religious life of the Sumerians, they help reconstruct the civilization of a people which for almost two millennia was the dominant cultural group of the Near East. Finally, because of their age, and as a result of their impact and impress on the literatures of their conquerors and neighbors, of their contemporaries and successors, they abound in source material basic to all the humanities dedicated to the study of man's cultural evolution. And yet, surprisingly enough, should the scholar or layman wish to familiarize himself more closely with the Sumerian literary heritage, he will search in vain for adequate and trustworthy translations. He will find no handbook of Sumerian literature such as that available for the Egyptian and Babylonian. Indeed until very recent years, even the cuneiform specialist had only a vague and sketchy notion of the nature and scope of the Sumerian belles-lettres. For the prospective translator of whatever Sumerian literary material had been published in the course of the past fifty years was confronted with two serious obstacles. On the one hand, he found an unsettled grammar and, in many cases, an unknown vocabulary. On the other hand, because of the fragmentary character of many of the tablets, he was confronted with a broken context which, especially in case of the longer compositions, offered him but few clues and very little guidance to the meaning of the contents as a whole. It is only now, largely with the help of the still unpublished material in the University Museum, that a large number of compositions can at last be pieced together and translated, wholly or at least in large part. The work, to be scientific and reliable, must be slow and gradual; the copy, the transliteration, the translation, the commentary and notes, all demand unusual care and require much time and patience. Nevertheless, unless the work is unexpectedly interrupted, there is good reason to hope that the coming decade will see the major part of the extant Sumerian belles-lettres restored and made available to scholar and layman.

Let us now turn to the myth whose contents it is my privilege to sketch in the pages to follow; in more ways than one it will serve as an excellent illustration of the preceding introductory comments. The story, whenever we grasp the meaning behind its details—and unfortunately, because of our present limited knowledge of the wider Sumerian mythological context, this is only too seldom—seems to translate into mythological terms the result of the poet's contemplation and speculation of certain natural

phenomena related to the agricultural life about him. Stylistically, it reveals some of the more characteristic features of Sumerian poetry: the oblique phrasing, the varied and dexterous use of the repetition pattern, the tendency toward understatement of detail, the typical evenness of mood and temper. Its significance for the history of literary and cultural evolution is indicated by the number of motifs which it has in common with the biblical paradise story; particularly illuminating is the light it sheds on the episode of the "rib." And finally, from the point of view of the restoration and translation of our Sumerian belles-lettres, it serves as a vivid and concrete reminder of the rather ineffective efforts of the past and as a hopeful and by no means insignificant token of the promise of the future.

It was as early as 1915, exactly thirty years ago, that Stephen Langdon published the text and translation of a Sumerian myth inscribed on a large and compactly written six-column tablet in the University Museum, which he entitled "Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood, and the Fall of Man."[1] The publication very naturally aroused the keen interest of the cuneiformists, and in the course of the next several years a number of studies were devoted to the myth.[2] The scholars found no difficulty in showing that Langdon's translation of the Sumerian text was most untrustworthy and that his interpretation of its contents was altogether unjustified. But it proved to be quite a different matter when it came to the actual preparation of a new and more trustworthy rendering of the contents of the poem. For, except for the elimination of Langdon's more obviously exaggerated claims, the translations attempted by his critics were almost as unfounded and misleading. And unfortunately two of the translations of the myth, both very largely erroneous, have now found their way into two American handbooks prepared for the more general student of religion and mythology.[3] The potential dangers in their indiscriminate use by students and teachers who are not in a position to evaluate the reliability of their contents are readily apparent. To reduce them to a minimum, I have devoted a good part of the past year to the preparation of a scientific edition of the myth. The study entitled "Enki and Ninhursag; A Sumerian 'Paradise' Myth,"[4] includes a transliteration, translation, and commentary, as well as excellent photographs of the tablet on which the myth is inscribed. It will appear in the very near future as

[1] Publications of the Babylonian Section X, No. 1, University Museum, University of Pennsylvania.

[2] For a detailed bibliography *cf.* Ernst Weidner, *Die Assyriologie 1914-1922*, Nos. 984-1012.

[3] Stephen Herbert Langdon, *Semitic Mythology* (Vol. V, *The Mythology of All the Races*, 1931), pp. 194-202, and George A. Barton, *Archæology and the Bible* (7th ed., 1937), pp. 337-343.

[4] Cf. also my *Sumerian Mythology* (Memoir XXI of the American Philosophical Society), pp. 54-59. The brief sketch there presented is based on a much earlier draft, and some of its details are to be modified in accordance with the new study.

the first of the *Supplementary Studies* of the *Bulletin* of the American Schools of Oriental Research. The following detailed sketch of the contents of the poem is based upon this new edition which, it is hoped, will soon be available to all who, for one reason or another, may find it useful to study the myth more closely.

The action of our myth takes place in Dilmun, the Sumerian "Abode of the Blessed," the land in which Ziusudra, the Sumerian flood hero, was settled by the gods after he had been granted immortality.[5] It opens with a eulogy of Dilmun, described both as a land and a city, and as a place that is pure, clean, and bright:[6]

[The *place*] is [pure] ....,
.. [the land] Dilmun is pure;
[The land Dilmun] is pure ....,
.. the [la]nd D[il]mun is pure;
The land Dilmun is pure, the land Dilmun is clean;
The land Dilmun is clean, the land Dilmun is bright.

Who had lain by himself in Dilmun—
The place, after Enki had lain with his wife,
That place is clean, that place is bright;
Who had lain by himself in Dilmun—
The place, after Enki had lain by Ninsikilla,
That place is clean, that place is bright.

Dilmun is a land in which, according to the obliquely phrased passage which follows, there is probably neither sickness nor death:

In Dilmun the raven utters no *cries,*
The *ittidû*-bird utters not the *cry of* the *ittidû*-bird,
The lion kills not,
The wolf snatches not the lamb,
Unknown is the kid-devouring *wild dog,*
Unknown is the grain-devouring ..,
Unknown is the .... widow,
The bird on high ..s not its ..,
The dove *droops* not the head,
The sick-eyed says not, "I am sick-eyed,"
The sick-headed says not, "I am sick-headed,"
Its (Dilmun's) old woman says not, "I am an old woman,"
Its old man says not, "I am an old man,"
Unbathed is the maid, no sparkling water is poured in the city,
Who crosses the river utters no ..,
*The wailing priest walks not round about him,*
The singer utters no *wail,*
By the side of the city he utters no *lament.*

[5] For a detailed study of Dilmun and its location, *cf.* my "Dilmun, The Land of the Living" in *BASOR,* XCVI, pp. 18-28.

[6] In the translation that follows, brackets enclose reasonably certain restorations; parentheses enclose explanations to help the reader; italics indicate doubtful renderings. Two dots indicate a break of one word; three dots, a break of two words; four dots, a break of three or more words.

But, as is evident from the goddess Ninsikilla's complaint in the badly mutilated passage which follows, what Dilmun seems to lack is fresh water and plant life:

Ninsikilla says to her father Enki:
"The city thou hast given, the city thou hast given, thy ....,
Dilmun, the city thou hast given, the city thou hast given, thy ....,
... thou hast given, the city thou hast given, thy ....,
Has not ... *of* the river,
[Dilmun, the city] thou hast given, the city thou hast given, thy ....,
....,
.... the *crop-raising fields* and farms,
....,
40. ....."

Enki thereupon commands that the sun-god Utu bring up for Dilmun fresh water from the earth. Utu does as commanded, and Dilmun becomes a fertile garden land:

[Father Enki answers Ninsikilla, his daughter]:
["Let Utu, *standing* in heaven],
[From the ...., the *breast* of *his* ...],
[From the .... of Nanna (the moon-god)],
[From the 'mouth whence issues the water of the earth,' bring thee sweet water from the earth];
Let him bring up the water into thy large ..,
Let him make thy city drink from it the waters of abundance,
Let him make Dilmun drink from it the waters of abundance,
Let thy well of bitter water become a well of sweet water,
49a. [Let thy *crop-raising* fields and farms *bear* thee grain],[7]
50. Let thy city become the house of the *banks and* quays of 'the land' (Sumer?),
Let Dilmun become the house of the *banks and* quays of 'the land,'
Now Utu is a ....."

Utu, *standing* in heaven,
From the ...., the *breast* of *his* ...,
From the .... of Nanna,
From the 'mouth whence issues the water of the earth,' brought her sweet water from the earth;
He brings up the water into her large ..,
Makes her city drink from it the waters of abundance,
Makes Dilmun drink from it the waters of abundance,
60. Her well of bitter water, verily it is become a well of sweet water,
Her *crop-raising* fields and farms *bore* her grain,
Her city, verily it is become the house of the *banks and* quays of 'the land,'
Dilmun, verily it is become the house of the *banks and* quays of 'the land,'
Now Utu is a .... ; verily it was so.

There follows a brief passage which may contain the poet's notion of the formation of the marshlands in the neighborhood of the deltas

[7] This line was omitted by the scribe; it is restored from line 61.

bordering on the Persian Gulf. For it is just barely possible that Enki is described as masturbating, and that our poet may be translating into anthropomorphic terms the unnatural and unfruitful action of the sea (*i.e., Enki*) to which he ascribed the coming into existence of the bleak and dreary marshlands:

Who is alone, *before* the wise Nintu, the mother of the 'land,'
Enki, *before* the wise Nintu, the mother of the 'land,'
*Causes his phallus to water* the ditches,
*Causes his phallus to submerge* the reeds,
*Verily causes his phallus to* ....,
Thereupon he said: "*Let* no one walk in the marshland";
Thereupon Enki said: "*Let* no one walk in the marshland."
He uttered the name of (*i.e.,* he swore by) An (the heaven-god).

The main action of our poem now begins. Enki first impregnates Ninhursag, the great Sumerian mother goddess also known in our poem under the name Nintu, and after nine days of pregnancy she gives birth without pain and effort to the goddess Ninmu:

*His* .. *of* the marshland, .. *of* the marshland,
Enki .. d *his* semen of Damgalnunna (Enki's wife),
Poured the semen into the womb of Ninhursag,
She took the semen into the womb, the semen of Enki,
One day being her one month,
Two days being her two months,
Three days being her three months,
Four days being her four months,
Five days being her five months,
Six days being her six months,
Seven days being her seven months,
Eight [days] being her eight months,
Nine [days] being her nine months, the months of "womanhood,"
L[ike .. fat], like .. fat, like good, princely fat,
[Nintu], the mother of the "land," like [.. fat], like .. fat, like good, princely fat,
Gave birth to [Ninmu].

Enki then proceeds to impregnate his daughter Ninmu who, in the same way as her mother Ninhursag, gives birth to the goddess Ninkurra:

Ninmu came forth to the bank of the river,
Enki in the marshland *looks about, looks about,*
He says to his messenger Isimud (a Janus-faced deity):
"Shall I not kiss the young one, the fair?
Shall I not kiss Ninmu, the fair?"
His messenger Isimud answers him:
"Kiss the young one, the fair,
Kiss Ninmu, the fair,
For my king I shall *blow up a mighty wind.*"
Alone he set his foot in the boat,
A second time he set there ....,

He embraced her, he kissed her,
Enki poured the semen into the womb,
She took the semen into the womb, the semen of Enki.
One day being her one month,
Two days being her two months,
Nine days being her nine months, the months of "womanhood,"
[Like ..] fat, like [.. fat], like good princely fat,
[Ninmu], like .. [fat], like .. fat, like good princely fat,
Gave birth to Nink[urra].

Enki then proceeds to impregnate his granddaughter Ninkurra, and the latter gives birth to the vegetation deity Uttu (not to be confused with the sun-god Utu):

Ninkurra [came forth to the bank of the river],
Enki in the marshland [*looks about, looks about*],
He [says] to his messenger Isimud:
"Shall I not [kiss] the young one, the fair?
Shall I not kiss Ninkurra, the fair?"
His messenger Isimud answers him:
"Kiss the young one, the fair,
Kiss Ninkurra, the fair,
For my king I shall *blow up a mighty wind.*"
Alone he set his foot in the boat,
A second time he set there ....,
He embraced her, he kissed her,
Enki poured the semen into the womb,
She took the semen into the womb, the semen of Enki.
One day being her one month,
Nine days being her nine months, the months of "womanhood,"
Like .. fat, like .. fat, like good, princely fat,
Ninkurra, like .. fat, like .. fat, like good princely fat,
Gave [birth] to Uttu, the *fair* lady.

Enki is now evidently all set to impregnate his great-granddaughter Uttu when Nintu (*i.e.*, Ninhursag), the great-grandmother, intervenes and offers the latter some pertinent advice. Unfortunately the relevant passage is badly mutilated. But to judge from the lines that follow, Uttu may have been instructed by Ninhursag not to cohabit with Enki until and unless he brings her a gift of cucumbers, apples(?), and grapes:

Nintu says [to] Uttu, [the *fair* lady]:
"Instruction I offer thee, [take] my instruction,
A word I speak to thee, [take] my word.
Someone in the marshland *look[s] about,* [*looks about*],
Enki in the marshland [*looks about, looks about*].
.... (approximately 15 lines are almost entirely destroyed)
*Bring* [the cucumbers in *their* ..],
*Bring* [the *apples*] in their [..],

*Bring* the grapes in their . . ,
In the house may he take hold of my leash (*i.e.*, fall into my trap?),
May Enki there take hold of my leash."

But whatever it is that Nintu has advised, we next see Enki obtain the cucumbers, apples(?), and grapes from a gardener, probably a minor deity rather than a man, who evidently brought them to him in gratitude for his watering the ditches, canals, and uncultivated places:

A second time while he was filling with water,
He filled the ditches with water,
He filled the canals with water,
He filled the uncultivated places with water,
The gardener *in the dust* in his joy . . . ,
He embrac[es] him:
"Who art thou who .... [*my*] garden?"
Enki answers the gardener:
". . . . ,
[*Bring me the cucumbers in their* . .],
[*Bring me the apples in their* . .],
[*Bring me the grapes in their* . .]."
[He] *brought* him the cucumbers in *their* . .],
He *brought* him the *apples* in *their* . . ,
He *brought* him the grapes in their . . , he heaped them on his lap.

Enki now brings these to Uttu as a gift, and the latter then receives his advances joyfully and cohabits with him:

Enki, his face turned green, he gripped the staff,
To Uttu Enki directed his step:
"Who . . st *in her house,* open, open."
"Thou, who art thou?"
"I, the gardener, would give thee cucumbers, *apples,* and grapes as a 'so be it' (gift?)."
Uttu with joyful heart opened the door of the house,
Enki to Uttu, the fair lady,
Gives the cucumbers in *their* . . ,
Gives the *apples* in their . . ,
Gives the grapes in their . . ,
Uttu, the fair lady, . . s for *him,* . . s for *him.*
Enki *took* his joy *of* Uttu,
He embraced her, lay in her lap,
. . s the . . , touches the . . . . ,
He embraced her, lay in her lap,
With the young one he cohabited, he kissed her.
Enki poured the semen into the womb,
She took the semen into the womb, the semen of Enki.

But of this union no new goddess is born. Instead, Ninhursag seems to utilize Enki's semen in a way which leads to the sprouting of eight different plants:

Uttu, the fair lady, ....,
Ninhursag ..d the *semen* from the ..,
[The "tree"-plant sprouted],
[The "honey"-plant spro]uted,
[The *roadweed*-plant spro]uted,
[The ..-plant s]prouted,
[The *thorn*-plant s]prouted,
[The *caper*-plant] sprouted,
[The ..-plant] sprouted,
The cassia-plant sprouted.

And now comes Enki's sinful deed. As he looked about him in the marshland, he noticed the eight plants and determined to decide their fate. But first, no doubt, he had to "know(?)" their heart, that is, he probably had to taste what they were like. And so his messenger, the two-faced god Isimud, plucks each of the eight plants for Enki, and the latter eats them one by one:

Enki in the marshland *looks about, looks about,*
He says to his messenger Isimud:
"Of the plants, their fate ....,
What, pray, is this? What, pray, is this?"
His messenger Isimud answers him:
"My [king], the 'tree'-plant," he says to him;
He (Isimud) cuts it down for him, he (Enki) eats it.
"My king, the 'honey'-plant," he says to him;
He plucks it for him, he eats it.
"My king, the *r*[*oadwee*]*d*-plant," he says to him;
He cuts it down for him, he eats it.
"My king, the ..-plant," he says to him;
He plucks it for him, he eats it.
"[My king, the *t*]*horn*-plant," he says to him.
[He cuts it down for him], he eats it.
"[My king, the *ca*]*per*-[plant]," he says to him;
[He plucks it for him, he eats it].
"[My king, the .. -plant," he says to him];
[He cuts it down for him], he eats it.
"My king, the cassia-plant," he says to him;
[He plucks it for him], he eats it.
Of the plants, [Enki] decreed their fate, *knew* their "heart."

Angered by this act, Ninhursag, the goddess who is largely responsible for the sprouting of the plants, utters a curse against Enki:

Thereupon Ninhursag cursed Enki's name:
"Until he is dead, I shall not look upon him with the 'eye of life.'"

And evidently as good as her word, she immediately disappears. Whereupon Enki, no doubt, begins to pine away, and the Anunnaki, the great

gods, sit in the dust. Enlil, the king of all the gods, seems unable to cope with the situation, when the fox breaks in with the statement that if properly rewarded he will bring Ninhursag back to the gods. Enlil names his reward, and the fox proves that his words are no idle boast; in one way or another—the passage is largely destroyed on the tablet—he does succeed in having Ninhursag return:

220. The Anunnaki sat in the dust.
Up speaks the fox to Enlil:
"If I bring Ninhursag before thee, what shall be my reward?"
Enlil answers the fox:
"If thou wilt bring Ninhursag before me,
In my city (*i.e.,* Nippur) I will *plant* trees *and fields* for thee, verily thy name will be uttered."
The fox, as one ..d *his skin,*
As one, *loosened his* ..,
As one, painted *his* face,
.... (approximately 16 lines badly mutilated)
Ninhursag ..d ...,
The Anunnaki seized her garments,
Made ....,
Decreed the fate,
*Interpreted* the ....

Now as a consequence of his having eaten the eight plants, eight organs of Enki's body had become sick. Ninhursag, therefore, seats the rapidly declining Enki by(?) her vulva to heal him. As Enki names each of the eight organs, she brings into existence a deity whose birth in some way results in the healing of the sick member. But it is to be carefully noted that there is nothing intrinsic or organic in the relationship between the sick member and the corresponding healing deity; it rests on the superficial and punlike etymologyzing of the ancient scribes in that the name of the sick organ contains at least one syllable in common with the name of the deity:

250. Ninhursag seated Enki *by* her vu[l]va:
"My brother, what hurts thee?"
"My .. hurts me."
"Abu I have caused to be born for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?"
"My *jaw* hurts me."
"Nintulla I have caused to be born for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?" "My tooth hurts me."
"Ninsûtu I have caused to be born for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?" "My mouth hurts me."
260. "Ninkasi I have [caused] to be [born] for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?" My .. [hurts me]."
"Nazi I have caused to be [born] for thee."

"My brother, what hurts thee?" "[My] arm [hurts me]."
"Azimua I have [caused] to be [born] for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?" "[My] rib [hurts me]."
"Ninti I have caused to be [born] for thee."
"My brother, what hurts thee?" "My .. [hurts me]."
"Enshag I have caused to be [born] for thee."

The poem concludes as Enki, probably at the request of Ninhursag, decrees the fates of the newborn deities:

"For the little ones which I have caused to be born ....."
"Let Abu be the king of the plants,
Let Nintulla be the lord of Magan,
Let Ninsutu marry Ninazu,
Let Ninkasi be she who *sates the desires*,
Let Nazi marry Nin*dara*,
Let Azi[mua] marry [Nin]gishzida,
Let N[inti] be the [qu]een *of the months*,
Let Enshag be the lord of Dilmun.
[O Father Enki], praise."

So much for the contents of our poem. The story is well-nigh complete, and at least on the surface the details of its plot are quite clear. Enki, the great god who has made Dilmun a land outstanding for its fruitfulness, probably forms the marshlands about the Persian Gulf, and then proceeds to impregnate in turn Ninhursag, her offspring Ninmu, and Ninmu's offspring, Ninkurra. He also impregnates Ninkurra's offspring Uttu, but only after first presenting her with cucumbers, apples(?), and grapes. Of this union, it is probably Ninhursag who in some way causes eight plants to sprout. Enki eats up the plants, and Ninhursag pronounces upon him a fatal curse. She disappears, but through the efforts of the fox, returns. As a result of the birth of eight deities, she brings about the cure of the eight sick organs of Enki's body. But what is the meaning behind all this mythological patter? What natural events, what physical and cosmic forces, is the poet aiming to portray in the seemingly crude symbolism of the incidents which he has plotted? With our present limited view of the Sumerian mythological horizon, it seems impossible in most cases to penetrate the thoughts of our poet, or to follow the reasons for the selection and arrangement of his motifs.

We conclude with what is probably one of the more significant aspects of our study, a comparative analysis of those motifs in our Dilmun poem which have, or at least seem to have, parallels in the biblical paradise story as told in the second and third chapters of Genesis. Thus Utu's watering of Dilmun with fresh water brought up from the earth is reminiscent of the biblical "But there went up an *'ēd* from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground" (Gen. 2:6). The birth of the

goddesses Ninmu, Ninkurra, and Uttu, which our poem stresses as having taken place without pain or travail, illuminates the background of the curse against Eve to conceive and bear children in sorrow. And obviously enough, Enki's eating of the eight plants and the curse uttered against him by Ninhursag, recall the eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge by Adam and Eve and the resulting curses.

But perhaps the most interesting result of our comparative analysis is the explanation which it provides for one of the more puzzling motifs in the biblical paradise story, the famous passage describing the fashioning of Eve, "the mother of all living," from the rib of Adam. For why a rib? Why did the Hebrew storyteller find it more fitting to choose a rib rather than any other of the bodily organs for the fashioning of woman whose name *ḥawwah, according to the biblical idea,* means approximately "she who makes live"? The reason becomes clear if we assume a Sumerian literary background, such as that represented by our Dilmun poem, underlying the biblical paradise story.[8] For in our Sumerian poem we find that one of Enki's sick organs is the rib (lines 265-266). Now the Sumerian word for rib is *ti.* The goddess whose birth in some way implied the healing of the rib was called, therefore, *$^{d}$nin-ti* which can mean "the Lady of the rib." But the very same Sumerian word *ti* also means "to make live." The name *$^{d}$nin-ti* may, therefore, also be rendered "the Lady who makes live." In Sumerian literature, therefore, "the Lady of the rib" came to be identified with "the Lady who makes live" through what may be termed a play on words. It was this, one of the most ancient examples of paronomasia, which was probably carried over and perpetuated in the biblical paradise story, although here, of course, it loses its validity, since in Hebrew the word for "rib" and that for "to make live" have nothing in common.[9]

[8] This is not to say, of course, that the Sumerian material was the *immediate* predecessor of the biblical story; the Hebrew writer, obviously enough, may have built on Babylonian, Canaanite, or other sources which had borrowed, modified, and molded the original motif.

[9] The same holds true, of course, for the language of whatever peoples may have preceded the Hebrews in the borrowing of the "rib" motif.

# THE MYSTICAL VALUE OF SCHOLARSHIP

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH
Yale University

THE SCHOLAR as one who works to benefit mankind by his discoveries and by training the young is familiar enough, at least as an ideal, to everyone. The scholar as one who is saving his own soul in scholarship, studying for what his studies do for and in himself, is less recognized even by the scholar. Yet the scholar has taken study for his lifework almost always because as a young man he found a fulfillment in study which other things did not offer. Like all spiritual calls, the call to study may indeed be prostituted into a desire for distinction, decoration, and prestige, since, again as in all spiritual callings, there are few who are the chosen ones, who really devote themselves to the call for its own sake. But as the monastery and the ministry insist that they are to be understood by their ideals rather than by their failures, so the value of scholarship for the scholar must not be obscured by the host who carry the *thyrsi* but are not *Bacchi*.

The fascination and rewards of scholarship were, so far as I know, first stated by Plato. In the *Phædo* he showed how Socrates, through life and up to the hour of death, passionately "asked questions," trying to come to an understanding of the nature of himself and his environment, of reality, in the sublime conviction that, while he was honest enough to admit the inadequacy of his answers, the very asking of the questions purified his soul and made him ready for association with that reality, here and hereafter. In the *Republic* he tried to devise a technique of education that would culminate in dialectic, as a result of which again man would go out of the cave of human limitations into the world of reality. True the man who had thus gone out would return to try to teach his fellow men, but with only meagre success: they would mostly think him mad or a fool for seeing beyond, and hence doubting, their categories. The marked achievement of his journey would be in the soul of the scholar himself.

This is still the best description of the power and value of scholarship in its effect upon the scholar. For whether we are Platonists or not, there can be no doubt that our minds function largely as they can discover form within the confusion of phenomena about us. The form we "discover" is often, if not always, one which, at one level of understanding at least, we seem to invent and impose upon nature. All nature which we see, for example, appears to us formalized in perspective, reduced to a pattern within perspective. The perspective does not exist in nature at all.

Only as the rays from light pass through a lens, or the tiny opening of a camera obscura, are they so arranged. The perspective which we see, and the world in perspective, exists only in our eyes and minds. Pure illusion. Yet seeing thus an illusory world we can, if we are skillful enough, hit a target at a great distance with a bullet; which shows that there is some relation between the illusory world of perspective and the real world, since the bullet, aimed in terms of one world, flies in terms of the other, and still hits the mark.

This is the process of scholarship. We create mathematical axioms and draw elaborate deductions from them. Then we can take the forms produced by these elaborate deductions and can use them to build the inconceivable complexities of balance of a George Washington Bridge, or a U.S.S. *Iowa*. Then we take still other axioms as a basis for even more complex mathematical deductions, and find that the forms which we have invented show predictable identity with the phenomena of the heavenly bodies. Are we then inventing or discovering? The process, so far as we are aware, is one of invention, and that is the word the mathematicians prefer for their work. But the result is over and over the far deeper glory of discovery. The greatest discovery of all is that in spite of our many errors, there actually is, as in the case of perspective, some correlation between the forms of our minds' creation and the external world.

In his own way the historian is doing much the same thing. With certain axioms of human conduct in his mind, axioms of human motivation and capacity, the historian shows how these motivations and capacities make form and sense out of the utterly chaotic phenomena of historical records and data. The axioms of historians are not so good as the Euclidean axioms, and have to be more frequently revised with expanding knowledge. In one age we think in terms of uniquely influential personalities as the basic elements of historical patterns; in the next our axioms are those of economic determinism. No set of axioms in history (as, to a less degree, in geometry) is final; yet each, by arranging the data in a peculiar perspective, reveals new aspects of truth in the objective world. This is true of all fields of history, apparent in the history of literature, of art, of politics, of economics, and of religion. In fields where we have not a scholarly approach we all try to make sense out of the phenomena directly, like the people chained to the seats within Plato's cave; in this we do not get very far. We must rise above mere information into a world of forms, by whatever name we prefer to call it, before we can understand what we see and hear.

The history of scholarship is largely the history of a great number of pedestrian minds trying to vindicate the visions of form behind and in matter which, in history, for example, were had by such people as Hegel,

or Ranke, or Marx, or Mommsen, or Maitland, or Spengler. How they came to their greater visions we who are lesser scholars cannot say, and I doubt if they themselves could tell us. Perception of form is something which, even on our level, we cannot teach to our graduate students, because, insofar as we have it ourselves, we do not understand it, and cannot control it. It is what the scientists, who do not like the language of philosophy and religion, prefer to call a "hunch." A scientist has a hunch that, behind the confusion of details he has been observing, such and such a factor is operating, and that the confusion will all become form and pattern if that can be proved. So he does not aimlessly set up experiments, but says to himself: "I'll bet that if I set up a certain type of experiment I'll get such and such results," because (he does not say) it will show that all the phenomena of the case fall into a certain pattern he has in mind. How he got that hunch or pattern he cannot tell his students in such a way that they will get similar hunches. Mme. Curie could train her students in technical proficiency. She could not teach any of them how it was that she suspected radial activity from the peculiar shadowy photograph produced by a bar of iron which lay all night between a photographic plate and a lump of pitchblende, so teach them that they themselves had such perceptions of their own. All science and history, all scholarly understanding, has been developed by people who were great scholars because they saw beyond the techniques of their crafts.

We grow mystical, but that is precisely what I should like to suggest. Far from there being any great gulf between the scholar and the mystic, the scholar is going to be creatively the scholar only insofar as he is not bound to the facts under his nose and the axioms and patterns proposed by his predecessors, but can himself go out of the cave, and return with new suggestions of form.

Scholarship, that is, is itself in the pattern of religion. For one of the most important functions of religion is to make sense out of the senseless world of ordinary experience. From the utter unpredictability of the hunting and fishing of primitive man, to the uncertainties of today, man has lived in a world in which he felt unsafe largely (note I do not say *entirely*) because he did not understand it. A terror understood ceases to terrify; an uncertainty explained loses most of its harassing power. Man has refused to leave the world and his place in it unaccounted for; so in religion, perhaps at first individually, but in all historic times in organized and official form, he has projected a myth or theology or philosophy to give meaning to the meaningless. The most helpful minister is still he who can go to men tortured by grief or pain or fear and soothe them by answering the inevitable question, Why? One can even bury a flowerlike little daughter if one understands why she had to die; it is

religion's function in the case to restore one's integrity by a sense that her death had meaning. Many is the person who has felt that such an event even added richness to life because the departing child led him to God, and to a greater sense of meaning in all existence. Religion does not simply tell men of a greater world of meaning outside the chaos of life: when it fulfills its function, it leads men out into that world.

Scholarship, in fact, has its appeal to the initiated largely because, whether the scholar is aware of it or not, scholarship is also a sacrament. In scholarship one studies facts until a meaning not at all explicit in them begins to suggest itself, and then one goes on to vindicate that meaning through the technique of the particular science or discipline. So the scholar has discovered a new bit of the pattern of man and the universe. This is the religious quest, and the scholar himself who had the experience of perception and validification has had, whether he likes it or not, a religious experience. The traditional religious quest asks not small questions but very large ones, such as the scholar cannot attempt to discuss in terms of his scholarship. Scholarship cannot yet, and probably never can, offer scholarly answers about the meaning of life and its true values. For that we must still rely upon the bolder projections of religion, formal or informal, which believes where it cannot prove. The religious experience in that case is the sense of achievement and relaxation which comes through having a pattern, a form, into which we may fit our own lives and the activities of society. Such a religious form may be a pure form, or an anthropological form, of the sort which religion has for the most part used. It may be the form of traditional values as handed down in the code of a caste. In any case, acceptance and conformity give the religious value of emotional stability which only a sense of form in life can give.

It is on a lower level, perhaps, certainly on a smaller scale, when the scholar perceives a form that would necessitate a certain result from an experiment in chemistry or physics, and then finds that perception vindicated as he performs the experiment. But if the pattern is smaller, the experience is profound because the vindication is more complete than any validification of the larger patterns of religion. We see those larger patterns in a glass darkly; we see the vindication of the hunch in chemistry, and, if to a lesser degree, in history, face to face.

Plato, we have said, knew that the questions put by the mind thus took one up a ladder into dialectic where truth was at last perceived. He insisted that it was found, however, only by those people who did not spend their time applying principles and hypotheses already advanced and accepted, but by those who refused to accept the given patterns as adequate, and tried to get behind popular, or scholarly, truisms. He was eternally

right. Scholarship which simply inflates a mind with information has no more value, at least for the person afflicted, than any other type of flatulence. Scholarship which simply works out the implications of the position of a school or a teacher is equally mundane. The mind in its quest for form is the creative scholarly mind. At the same time it is the mind on a religious quest, and only insofar as we can penetrate afresh and for ourselves into the mystic region whence forms seem to emerge, or into mystic union with our materials so that we can perceive forms within them, can scholarship be a sacrament.

Such scholarship is far from being socially useless. It has all the value of any mysticism in its effect upon the mystic, as it is the *sine qua non* for constructive research. Religion and life are by no means antipathetic; they are identical. All types of activity and all interests yield their deepest rewards to the individual and society only as the interests are cast in the religious form of seeking and finding the heart's desire and the basis of life. Religious leaders have impoverished religion by putting it into a corner, by insisting that it is the quest of goals with specific theological names. In trying to force men to certain sacraments, to a few exclusive patterns of meaning for life, they have robbed men of many means of grace. They have done so with such success that a large percentage of those who practise the religion of scholarship would deny that it is a religion at all, or at least would be amazed at hearing it called so; many of them would resent such a classification because, while most formal religion is dedicated to reaffirming and practising the postulates of tradition, scholarship begins by questioning them. But let scholars and religious leaders alike reject as they will this identification, the experiences of scholars belie all the distinctions, for the scholar's experience is truly religious.

What I am trying to suggest is that religion would be very wise indeed if it made room for scholars, not by forcing them to accept the traditional patterns of formal religion, but by claiming them as its own because of what they are doing as scholars. And scholars would be deeply enriched if, more conscious of what they are doing, they learned what other mystics have to teach of the methods of such experiences, and of how to utilize in their persons the rewards. The young scholar in particular would be enormously clarified if he were directly taught that his business is not to become a faithful pupil of his teacher, but to find forms for himself, find forms of universal validity in his material because he finds them within himself.

# EXPLORING THE JORDAN AND DEAD SEA WITH THE U. S. NAVY

RAYMOND S. HAUPERT
Moravian College and Theological Seminary

In the officer personnel of the U. S. Navy during the Mexican War was a lieutenant, William Francis Lynch by name, who, over a period of years, had toyed with the idea of a trip to Palestine. With the fall of Vera Cruz on May 8, 1847, Lieutenant Lynch, realizing that there was little left for the Navy to do in winning the Mexican War, applied to the Honorable John Y. Mason, Secretary of the Navy, for "permission to circumnavigate and thoroughly explore" the Dead Sea.[1] On July 31, Lynch was informed that permission had been granted and was authorized to proceed with necessary preparations.

On October 2, Lynch was ordered to take command of the storeship *Supply* which was to serve as supply ship for the expedition. While the *Supply* was being fitted for the long voyage to the eastern Mediterranean, Lynch arranged, by special authority, for the construction of two metal boats, one of copper and the other of galvanized iron, by means of which it was proposed to negotiate the Jordan and circumnavigate the Dead Sea.

In addition to Lieutenant John B. Dale and Passed Midshipman Richmond Aulick, who were detailed to assist Lieutenant Lynch, ten seamen were shipped for the expedition. Of the process of selecting his men, Lynch writes:

> I was very particular in selecting young, muscular, native-born Americans, of sober habits, from each of whom I exacted a pledge to abstain from all intoxicating drinks. To this stipulation, under Providence, is principally to be ascribed their final recovery from the extreme prostration consequent to the severe privations and great exposure to which they were unavoidably subjected.[2]

A month and a half was spent in gathering stores, collecting materials, procuring information, and assembling equipment. One seaman was a mechanic able to assemble the metal boats which were made in sections. Airtight gum-elastic water bags were prepared to serve, when inflated, as life preservers in case of destruction of the boats. Arms and weapons consisted of a blunderbuss, fourteen carbines with long bayonets, and fourteen pistols, four revolving and ten with bowie-knife blades attached. Officers were equipped with swords, and all members of the expedition were provided with ammunition belts. With the gathering of such

[1] W. F. Lynch, *Narrative of the U. S. Expedition to the River Jordan and the Dead Sea*, 1849, p. 2. See also W. F. Lynch, *Official Report of the U. S. Expedition to Explore the Dead Sea and the River Jordan*, 1852.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

materials as tents, flags, instruments, sails, oars, preserved meats, and cooking utensils, all preparations were completed. After a six-day delay at the Battery in waiting for favorable winds anchor was weighed on November 26, 1847.

At this juncture, we may well pause to ask, Just who was William Francis Lynch, worthy successor of Edward Robinson in applying the scientific method to Palestinian exploration? Furthermore, how is the presence of a United States naval expedition in Palestine in 1848 to be explained?

Lynch was born in Norfolk, Virginia, in 1801. Never very firmly attached to his home as the result of the early death of his mother, and the preoccupation of his father with the care of property, Lynch eagerly welcomed appointment as midshipman at the Academy at the age of eighteen. Ten years later, after naval cruises had taken him to Brazil, China, and around the world, he was advanced to the rank of lieutenant. On one occasion, while still a midshipman, he had been a member of a crew which escorted Lafayette across the Atlantic.

Beyond all this, the expedition to Palestine cannot be explained apart from a rather unusual combination of personal qualities in its leader, among which were pronounced competence as a naval officer, a devout religious attitude, which fostered an emotionalized interest in Palestine, and a genuine spirit of adventure, fortified by what may be called typically American inventiveness, resourcefulness, and initiative.

The voyage from New York Bay to Cape Vincent, Portugal, took twenty-one days. On December 17, the *Supply* anchored at Gibraltar. The outbreak of a case of smallpox caused a delay of a month and a half at Minorca. On February 4, the *Supply* moved eastward, passing Sardinia, Pantelleria, Malta, and finally sailed into the Gulf of Smyrna on February 15.

At Smyrna, Lynch took passage on an Austrian steamer for Constantinople in order to apply in person to the sultan for a firman for the proposed expedition. While awaiting the audience with the sultan, Lynch, accompanied by the dragoman of the American legation, was waited upon by his majesty's pipe bearers. On this situation, Lynch comments as follows: "I am not a smoker, and hold, with King James I, that

> 'If there be any herb, in any place,
> More opposite to God's herb of grace,'

it is tobacco; but as the opportunity of inhaling the odour of the weed of royalty might never again present itself, my inclinations jumped accordant with the rules of etiquette, and I puffed away with as much vivacity as any Turk."

A major crisis almost developed when the chamberlain in waiting objected to Lynch's sword and insisted that it be laid aside before the interview with the sultan. Lynch insisted equally upon his right to retain his sword since he was appearing as a naval officer, and was finally sustained by a higher authority.

In spite of a pleasant audience with the sultan on February 26, the firman was not forthcoming until eight days later. Lynch translates the firman as follows:

> Governors of Saida and Jerusalem!—Captain Lynch, of the American navy, being desirous of examining the Dead Sea (Bahr Lut), his legation has asked for him, from all our authorities, all due aid and assistance.
>
> You will, therefore, on the receipt of this present order, give him and his companions, seventeen in number, all due aid and co-operation in his explorations.
>
> Protect, therefore, and treat him with a regard due to the friendship existing between the American Government and that of the Sublime Porte.
>
> (Signed) MUSTAFA RESCHID PASHA,
> Grand Vizier.
>
> Mustafa Pasha, Governor of Saida.
> Zarif Pasha, Governor of Jerusalem.
> Stambohl, March 7, 1848.

Sailing from Smyrna on March 10, a visit was made to Ephesus on March 14. On March 20, Patmos was sighted at close range, and five days later, the mountains of Lebanon and the harbor of Beirut.

In Beirut, Lynch consulted with Eli Smith, the American Presbyterian missionary who had traveled through Palestine with Edward Robinson in 1838, and who was to travel again with Robinson in 1852. With Smith's help, a competent Syrian dragoman was secured. At Beirut also, Henry J. Anderson, M.D., of New York, joined the expedition in the double capacity of physician and geologist. Lynch was particularly pleased that the services of a physician could be obtained since he anticipated that there would be need of surgical treatment for gunshot wounds, since he had been informed that a short time before an English party on a similar venture had been attacked while trying to descend the Jordan. Furthermore, since Lieutenant Molyneux, R.N., commander of the English party, and Costigan, who had preceded him in exploring the Dead Sea, had both died of fever caught on the Dead Sea, the services of a physician were particularly desirable.

After a delay of several days on account of heavy surf, the entire equipment of the expedition, including the two metal boats, was unloaded near Acre on March 31. At this point began a series of major and minor crises such as anyone who has traveled in the Near East can fully understand.

Sa'id Bey, Turkish governor at Acre, had agreed to furnish horses to pull the metal boats overland to the Lake of Galilee. Lynch describes the horses which were brought in as "most miserable galled jades, and upon trial entirely unused to draught."[3] The harnesses brought from America fitted so loosely as to be ludicrous. After various exhibitions of plunging, rearing, and kicking, all thought of using Sa'id Bey's horses was abandoned. Sa'id Bey professed deep sorrow but solemnly affirmed that there were no better horses to be had. Lynch proposed using oxen, but it was objected that this would deprive the local farmers of the means of planting their crops.

Another acute problem arose when an uncontrollable mob of natives threatened to plunder the American camp on the beach. The posting of sentries plus the imprint of pointed steel on the flanks of two or three natives solved this particular problem. On April 1, 1848, the day after the equipment had been unloaded, the *Supply* sailed out to sea, leaving the expedition to face its task without further support. Later in the day, Sa'id Bey tried, without success, to frighten Lynch into hiring a hundred soldiers at a cost of twenty thousand piastres ($800) to guarantee security for the venture.

On the following morning, Sunday, April 2, after religious exercises in the tradition of the U. S. Navy, a successful effort was made to use camels instead of horses in hauling the metal boats. It was discovered that three large camels could pull a boat on its wheeled carriage with perfect ease, despite the grotesque appearance of the horse harnesses on the camels. Lynch expresses surprise that the Romans, in contrast to the Parthians, never used the camel in warfare.

Two days later the caravan set out for the Sea of Galilee, with the two metal boats, camel-drawn, leading the way, followed by sixteen horses, eleven loaded camels, and one mule. On April 6, two days later, the first view of the Sea of Galilee was had from the mountainous upland country above Tiberias. In the course of this and succeeding days the metal boats were painstakingly and successfully brought down the mountainside and launched at Tiberias.

Preliminary investigations indicated that the bottom of the Sea of Galilee was a concave basin with a maximum depth of 165 feet. At Tiberias the Yankee sailors had a long conversation with an Arab boatman who had been a member of Molyneux's expedition. It was the opinion of the Arab boatman that boats as large as the American metal boats could not possibly navigate the Jordan on account of rapids, cascades, false channels, innumerable rocks, and one cataract. Concerning these difficulties, Lieutenant Lynch comments as follows:

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

That we should encounter great obstacles, perhaps seemingly insurmountable ones, I did not doubt; but I had great faith in American sailors, and believed that what men could do, they would achieve. So there was no thought of turning back.[4]

At Tiberias final plans were made for division of labor and of responsibilities for the trip down the Jordan valley. In order to provide added security for the boats, Lynch reversed an earlier opinion, dividing his forces into a land party and a river party. The land party was in command of Lieutenant Dale. It included Dr. Anderson, who was charged with making geological observations and collecting specimens; Mr. Bedlow, who was to note the appearance of the country on the land route; Mr. Francis Lynch, who was to collect specimens of plants and flowers; three Arab gentlemen, whom Lynch considered to be of great value to the expedition; and ten Bedouin videttes as mounted sentinels. Lieutenant Lynch took charge of the copper boat, the *Fanny Mason,* assigning to himself the duty of observing "the course, rapidity, colour, and depth of the river and its tributaries,—the nature of its banks, and of the country through which it flowed,—the vegetable productions, and the birds and animals we might see, with a journal of events."[5] Midshipman Aulick was placed in command of the *Fanny Skinner,* the iron boat, and was directed to make a topographical sketch of the river and its banks. On the assumption that the chief danger would be that of ambush for the river party, the land party was ordered to keep as near to the river as possible, and to come with all possible speed to the help of the river party if they should hear two guns fired in quick succession.

On April 10, at 2:00 p.m., the three boats (including an old wooden boat, *Uncle Sam,* acquired at Tiberias) and the land caravan left Tiberias. One hour and forty-five minutes later the boats entered the lower Jordan whose width here averaged about seventy-five feet, and whose banks were about thirty feet high. Current at the point was two knots. Oars were necessary only to keep the boats in the channel.

The next morning a three hundred yard stretch of foaming rapids was encountered. It was necessary to empty the boats completely, and sending the sailors overboard to swim alongside and guide them, thus to shoot the first rapids. This was only the beginning of difficulty since below and just ahead were five successive falls, about eighteen feet altogether, with rapids in between. It required four hours of hard work in waist-deep water to get the three boats past the rapids.

Early in the afternoon the boats descended the cascade at an angle of thirty degrees and at a speed of twelve knots. Later in the day at one point the river was sixty yards wide, with a current of three knots. A

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 165.
[5] *Ibid.,* p. 169.

short distance farther on, the water became clearer and was eight feet deep. Fish could often be seen in the clear water. Members of river and land groups were impressed alike with the richness of the alluvial soil on both sides of the river.

Since there was danger of attack from nomadic tribes at any time, guards were rigidly posted for the night, despite the fatigue of all members of the party. One officer and four men, all fully armed, mounted guard for two hours at a time. Everyone slept with cartridge belt on, and his arms within reach.

The average width of the Jordan for the day was forty yards; depth ranged from two and a half to six feet. Nine rapids had been encountered. The wooden boat, *Uncle Sam*, foundered as the result of striking too many submerged rocks. Lynch's judgment was amply vindicated in the ability of the metal boats to survive frequent contact with rocks and remain seaworthy.

The next day, just below the camp site, it was necessary to negotiate a cascade of eleven feet, with the water flowing at an angle of sixty degrees directly against a large rock at the foot of the passage. A rope was attached to the boat and secured to a bush upstream which made it possible to hold the boat poised until headed past the obstructing rock at a safe distance.

The Yarmuk at its mouth was found to be forty yards wide, as wide and as deep as the Jordan. The current of the Jordan for the day had averaged about eight miles per hour. Camp was made at Jisr el Majami', on the route from Beisan to Damascus. The next day, April 13, was one of uneventful progress, with camp two hours below Beisan.

In view of the fact that the airline distance from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea is sixty-five miles, and the river distance approximately two hundred miles, it can readily be understood that the cartographer of the expedition found it very difficult to produce a correct sketch of the topography of the Jordan. In the space of a half hour, the Jordan was found to head north, south, east, and west, flowing in the direction of every quarter of the compass.

The descent of the many rapids made constant demands upon the skill of the whole party. Lynch consistently placed the copper boat, the *Fanny Mason,* in the lead, believing that copper had a better chance of surviving the rocks. The following description in Lynch's own words gives a graphic picture of the whole procedure.

> When the sound of a rapid was distinct and near, the compass and the note-book were abandoned, and, motioning to the *Fanny Skinner* to check her speed, our oars began to move like the antennæ of some giant insect, to sweep us into the swiftest, which is ever the deepest, part of the current; when it caught us, the boat's

crew and our Arab friend Jumâh (Friday) leaped into the angry stream, accoutred as they were, and, clinging to her sides, assisted in guiding the graceful *Fanny* down the perilous descent. In this manner she was whirled on, driving between rocks and shallows with a force that made her bend and quiver like a rush in a running stream;—then, shooting her through the foam and the turmoil of the basin below, where, in the seething and effervescing water, she spun and twirled, the men leaped in, and, with oars and rudder, she was brought to an eddying cove, from whence, by word and gesture, she directed her sister *Fanny* through the channel.[6]

April 15, five days after the departure from Tiberias, found the expedition more than halfway to the Dead Sea. At this portion of the river the average width was fifty-six yards and the average depth a little more than four feet. Two days later, in the early afternoon, the mouth of the Zerka, or River Jabbok, was reached. Lynch describes it as "a small stream trickling down a deep and wide torrent bed." Just beyond this point a wild boar was sighted swimming across the river.

On April 18, Lynch reported to the Secretary of the Navy his safe arrival at Meshra'a, on the Jordan, near Jericho, within a few miles of the Dead Sea. The navigation of the Jordan had been accomplished in eight days, in spite of twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a large number of less difficult rapids.

The Jordan at the point where it enters the Dead Sea was found to be 180 yards wide and three feet deep. A rendezvous with the land caravan was arranged at 'Ain Feshḥah on the west shore of the Dead Sea, about six miles from the mouth of the Jordan.

The two metal boats, in an effort to cross to the eastern shore and zigzag back to 'Ain Feshḥah taking soundings at stated points en route, ran into serious difficulty on account of strong wind and heavy sea. For a time neither boat made any headway, and Lynch feared that both boats would founder. The waves, because of the density of the Dead Sea water, struck the boats with sledge-hammer blows. The crews of both boats found themselves covered with a greasy salt, with eyes, nostrils, and lips smarting painfully. Lynch thought of Costigan and Molyneux, one found dying on the shore of the Dead Sea, and the other having died in the preceding November of fever contracted there. Within an hour, however, the wind fell, and twenty minutes later, the surface was entirely placid. Encamped a mile below 'Ain Feshḥah, they heard the convent bell of Mar Saba at midnight.

The next day, Dale and Aulick were sent out to take soundings on a diagonal course to the eastern shore. A heavy sea prevented their return until late the same evening. Dale reported that the floor of the Dead Sea to the southeast was a level plain, 1,020 feet deep.

On April 21, camp was broken at 'Ain Feshḥah for the purpose of

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 214-215.

moving to 'Ain Jidy. In moving southward along the west shore, a stop was made at the mouth of the Wady en-Nar, the wady formed at Jerusalem by the union of the Valley of Hinnom and the Kidron. The wady, a deep gorge with sides 1,200 feet high, was found to be perfectly dry.

Among the plants found on the shore of the Sea was a species of kale called *Salicornia Europea,* a plant found near salt water or saline formations. Lynch notes that Frémont found this plant on the shores of the Great Salt Lake, west of the Mississippi. A duck was sighted, and shot at, fully twelve miles from the Jordan.

At 'Ain Jidy the boats were examined and were found to be much battered, with keels, stems, and stemposts fractured.

In a conversation with Lynch at 'Ain Jidy, Sherif, a steadfast and honored Arab who had joined the expedition at Acre, said that he "had often heard of the tyranny of the Franks towards each other, but never thought they would have sent their countrymen to so desolate a place as this."[7] Many of the Arabs suspected that the Americans were in search of gold. Their suspicions were amply confirmed when they saw Dr. Anderson hammering rocks in search of geological specimens.

The camp at 'Ain Jidy was named "Camp Washington," and was now constituted as the base for all operations on the Dead Sea, including the taking of soundings, the preparation of topographical sketches, and the making of astronomical and barometrical observations. At 'Ain Jidy a current was observed moving northward along the shore, and farther out another current moving southward. The southbound current was believed to be caused by the impetus of the Jordan, and the northbound current by the eddy of the southbound deflected by Jebel Usdum and the southern shore of the Sea.

Frequent reference is made to the pronounced smell of sulphur almost everywhere in the immediate environs of the Sea. Molyneux believed it to come from the water itself. Lynch, however, found the water to be greasy, acrid, and disagreeable, but entirely without odor, and was inclined to attribute the sulphurous smell to the springs and marshes along the shores of the Sea, and to the stagnant pools of the flat plain which borders the Sea on the north.

On Monday, April 24, Lieutenant Lynch and Dr. Anderson, accompanied by a crew of seamen, set out in the *Fanny Mason* for the peninsula which the Arabs call the *lisān,* or tongue. Midshipman Aulick was directed to take the other boat, and proceed directly to Wady el Môjib, the river Arnon, on the eastern shore, making soundings as he went. Dale and the rest of the party were to remain at the camp site to make observations for determining the position of the camp, and to measure

[7] *Ibid.,* p. 292.

angles for the ends of the base line. In making soundings, the contents of each cast, including various types of mud, and many well-formed cubic salt crystals, were carefully sealed in airtight vessels.

The peninsula was found to be from forty to sixty feet high, with a sharp angular ridge some twenty feet higher, and a wide margin of sand at its foot, heavily encrusted with salt and bitumen. Dr. Anderson described the peninsula as "a loose, calcareous marl, with encrustations of salt, and indications of sulphur, nitre, gypsum, marly clays, etc.,"[8] and the northern extremity, as chalky, with flints, and of a texture soft and crumbling. From the *lisān,* Lynch steered directly across to measure the width of the strait between the peninsula and the western shore, returning to camp at 6:00 p.m., with the temperature at 92°. Aulick had found the width on the direct route to the eastern shore to be nine miles, and maximum depth, 1,128 feet. The Arnon proved to be a considerable stream of clear, fresh, and moderately cool water flowing between high walls of red sandstone.

On Tuesday, April 25, an extensive reconnaissance of the southern part of the Sea was begun, Sherif being left in charge of the camp, along with four Turkish soldiers and Read, a seaman who had been taken ill with a chronic illness not connected with the rigors of the region. Course was held almost directly south, from point to point along the western shore. The immediate purpose in keeping close to shore was to protect the accompanying Arabs who feared an attack by marauding tribesmen.

Eight and a half nautical miles below 'Ain Jidy the explorers found themselves directly opposite Sebbeh, identified by Robinson as Masada, two miles from the shore. Masada was first fortified by Jonathan Maccabæus, and later developed by Herod the Great, and finally figured in the Roman wars when, according to Josephus, Eleazar and 967 Sicarii carried out a suicide compact to forestall imminent capture by Flavius Sylva.

Efforts to find a ford from this point to the peninsula, as indicated in the map of Robinson and Smith, were unsuccessful.

Camp was set up in a little cove five or six miles north of Jebel Usdum. Occasional lumps of bitumen were found along the shore here and elsewhere. Lynch notes that the bitumen presented a bright, smooth surface when broken, and had the appearance of a solidified fluid. The Arabs called the substance *hajar Mousa* (rock of Moses). With a hot wind, the temperature at 9:00 p.m. was 86°; at midnight, 88°; and at 4:00 a.m., 86°. It was difficult to sleep, since a handkerchief over the face as protection from the hot wind only made the heat more oppressive.

Proceeding southward the next morning, Lieutenant Lynch and

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 298.

Dr. Anderson went ashore to examine a round pillar of salt located on Jebel Usdum at a point one third of the distance from its northern tip. This pillar was found to be of solid salt, capped with carbonate of lime, the upper, rounded portion, forty feet high, resting on a kind of oval pedestal, forty to sixty feet above the Sea.

The Sea now was becoming so shallow as to make navigation difficult. To the west the boats could not get nearer to the beach than two hundred yards. To the south the iron boat, with less draught than the copper boat, was grounded three hundred yards from the shore. Shortly before grounding, a cave in Jebel Usdum, described by Robinson, was to be seen. Those who went ashore here described their sensation in terms of running over burning ashes.

Cruising eastward about three quarters of a mile from the south shore, which was as near as the shallowness of the water permitted, Lynch was particularly impressed with the unmitigated desolation of the landscape. While skirting the south shore, in full view of the peninsula, or *lisān,* Lynch named its northern tip "Point Costigan," and its southern extremity, "Point Molyneux," in memory of the two Englishmen who had recently lost their lives in the effort to explore the Sea.

As they approached the eastern shore with its overtowering hills two thousand feet high, it became oppressively hot, with an air temperature at 3 : 30 p.m. of 97°, and a water temperature twelve inches below the surface of 90°. At 3 : 50, a blistering hurricane struck from the southeast, and for a time threatened to drive the boats out to sea. The temperature immediately rose to 102°. Forty minutes later, after a hard pull, both boats made the shore near Wady Humeir with all their occupants physically exhausted. Each used his own ingenuity in struggling against the excessive heat, some going up the wady for shelter, others crouching under the beached boats.

As the sun went down, the heat increased. At 8 : 00 p.m., the temperature was 106° five feet above the ground. At one foot above the ground it was 104°. At nine o'clock the water supply was exhausted. Fatigue in addition to fear of hostile Arabs made it unwise to try to locate water at that time. At midnight the temperature was 98°. The wind now shifted to the north, and by 4 : 00 a.m. the temperature had come down to 82°—"comparatively cool," as Lynch noted.

The next morning the copper boat made soundings directly across to the western shore, the depth varying from 10½ to 13½ feet. Camp was made on the *lisān.*

On Friday, April 28, it became necessary to return to 'Ain Jidy because of the exhaustion of water supplies. Arrival at 'Ain Jidy brought news of the outside world. With the information that ex-President John Quincy Adams had passed away, the camp flag was flown at half-mast.

Referring to "startling news from Europe," manifestly concerning the various revolutions of 1848, Lynch comments as follows:

> The great Being who wisely rules over all, is doubtless punishing the nations for their sins; but, as His justice is ever tempered with mercy, I have not the smallest doubt that when the ordeal is passed, the result will be beneficial to the human race. The time is coming—the beginning is even now—when the whole worthless tribe of kings, with all their myrmidons, will be swept from their places and made to bear a part in the toils and sufferings of the great human family;—when, not in theory only, but in fact, every man will be free and all men politically equal;—then, this world will be a happy one, for liberty, rightly enjoyed, brings every blessing with it.[9]

An ample supply of sugar and lemons had been brought from Jerusalem. Consequently, 'Ain Jidy, with lemonade, coffee, abundance of water, and shelter from the sun, became almost a paradise.

An experiment was made at this time to see whether a horse or a donkey could swim in the sea without turning over. Both horse and donkey demonstrated ability to retain their balance in spite of the great buoyancy of the water, even though they turned a little on one side.

On April 29, Midshipman Aulick was detailed to make soundings on a north and south line between the peninsula and the western shore. The soundings indicated a gradual decrease in depth to seventy-eight feet, making it quite apparent that the entire portion of the Sea south of the peninsula was relatively and progressively shallow.

On the same day a party was sent along the shore to Sebbeh under Lieutenant Dale. By eight o'clock, after a difficult trip which was a tribute to the Arab horses, they reached Wady Sebbeh, and, one hour later, the ravine which separates Sebbeh from the main ridge to the north. From this point, with much exertion and great difficulty, they climbed the almost perpendicular slope to the top, 863 feet above the lowest point in the Roman wall of circumvallation on the east side.[10] Dale and his companions believed that the path by which they had ascended was the so-called "serpentine" path of Josephus. The writer of this paper is of the opinion that, if Lynch correctly interpreted Dale's report, Dale and his companions gained access to the top of Masada by means of what is now taken to be the remains of the Roman ramp, and that the serpentine trail is to be found elsewhere.

The summit of Masada was found to measure three quarters of a mile in length from north to south, and one quarter mile from east to west. The ruins of a wall lined the edge of the summit. Remains of excavations originally used as cisterns or granaries were in evidence. A gateway with a pointed arch was a prominent feature of the surface

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 322.

[10] This figure derived from Schulten's contour map; see A. Schulten, *Masada,* Leipzig, 1933.

remains. At the northwest corner of the summit a large excavated chamber was found, nicely stuccoed, with a gallery, a flight of forty stone steps, and two windows opening to the south. Lynch's comment on Dale's report reads as follows:

> Their report seems to confirm the supposition of Messrs. Robinson and Smith that the ruins of Sebbeh are those of Masada. At every step in our route, where these gentlemen have been, we found that accurate and learned observers had preceded us, and in these precursors, with no little satisfaction, we recognised our own countrymen.[11]

At this time, while all members of the expedition, with one exception, had enjoyed good health, there were symptoms which caused Lynch some uneasiness. The figures of each had begun to assume what Lynch calls a "dropsical appearance." Those who were lean had become stout, and the stout had become somewhat corpulent. Pale faces had become florid, and the florid faces ruddy. Furthermore, the slightest scratch festered. Nevertheless, there was no reason whatever for believing that there was any thing pestilential in connection with the Sea, as had been commonly supposed.

On a trip from 'Ain Jidy to Point Costigan on April 30, one sounding indicated a depth of 1,300 feet. For a time they moved under power of sail, and the sailors slept. Again Lynch was uneasy because of their flushed appearance and their feverish sleep. As he sat steering the drowsily moving boat, he began to feel that he was "a Charon ferrying, not the souls, but the bodies of the departed and the damned, over some infernal lake, and could endure it no longer."[12] Partly to relieve his uneasiness, he ordered the sails furled and the oars into action. Continuing into the bay, and approaching the eastern shore, the party was welcomed by Jum'ah who, along with his superior, 'Akil, had been sent out from 'Ain Feshḥah to conciliate the Kerak Arabs in advance. In due time a delegation of Christian Arabs from Kerak appeared and extended a warm welcome to the explorers. Having never seen a boat, they examined both metal boats with great curiosity, supposing that the boats must have feet.

On May 1, Dale and Aulick were sent out to complete topographical sketches of the shore line of the bay, to verify the location of the mouth of Wady Kerak, and to take soundings down the middle of the bay. Some time was spent in overhauling the copper boat which was corroding rapidly.

Some of the Kerak Arabs were persuaded to take a short ride on the sea. Immediately upon returning, they put onion plugs into their nostrils, to counteract the wicked or dangerous influences which they believed they

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 335.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 338.

had imbibed as a result of being on the sea, which they called "the sea accursed of God."

The next day Lynch decided to accept an invitation for his entire party to visit Kerak. While realizing that there were serious dangers involved, he was also conscious that his men needed the rehabilitation of a higher altitude. Seaman Henry Loveland, who of all members of the party appeared to be least affected by the rigors of the recent experiences, was left behind with nine Arabs to guard the boats and properties.

The ascent to Kerak, which Lynch describes as being three thousand feet above the Sea, was an unusual experience on account of the picturesque landscape and in consequence of a heavy thunderstorm en route which put a large quantity of water into the wady. One night was spent at Kerak, memorable both on account of persistent fleas and a feeling of insecurity. Early on the following day a return was made to the camp on the Sea, Lynch having carefully anticipated the possibility of ambush and the potentialities of defense. Weapons were kept constantly ready for action. A young Moslem sheikh named Muhammad had been surly, ill-mannered, and arrogant. All of his demands for gifts Lynch firmly refused. When he pursued the company for the purpose of continuing his demands, Lynch ordered an officer and a trusted seaman to ride next to him regardless of his companions, and to shoot him at the first indication of flight or treachery. Muhammad gradually realized that he was virtually a prisoner, and soon lost all of his insolence. One other incident of the descent to the Sea may be mentioned. A delay was caused by an unmanageable mule which refused to permit a sailor to remount until the latter had put on the flowing outer garments of the Arabs.

While at Kerak, Lynch made the following observation concerning the Arabs, which is illustrated by T. E. Lawrence in 1917, "Their God is gold, and fifty well-armed, resolute Franks, with a large sum of money, could revolutionize the whole country."[13]

Both boats now proceeded northward along the eastern shore to a camp site on the south side of the Wady el Môjib delta. The Arnon at its mouth is eighty-two feet wide and four feet deep, and flows through a chasm of perpendicular walls of sandstone, colored red, brown, and yellow, as if by artists' design.

The next morning, Dale was sent to take soundings across the Sea to 'Ain Turabeh. Lynch continued northward, recahing Zerqâ Ma'in, the outlet for the hot springs of Callirrhoë, at 12:20 p.m. The following temperatures were noted: air, 77°; sea, 78°; stream, 94°; stream one mile up the chasm, 95°. The water was slightly sulphurous to the taste. Lynch bathed that evening, first in the Sea, and then in the stream, describing

[13] *Ibid*, p. 360.

as "a most delicious transition" the change "from the dense acrid water of the sea," which made their many sores to smart painfully, to "the soft, tepid, refreshing waters of Callirrhoë."[14]

On Friday, May 5, Lynch rose at 2:00 a.m. to hasten preparations for the final phase of the exploration. It had been his plan to visit Machærus, but, with some reluctance, he decided that this could not be attempted, because of the increasing heat of the sun and the marked lassitude of his men. At 3:40 all hands were aroused, and in due time a course was set directly toward 'Ain Turabeh on the west shore, intersecting the diagonal course of the day before. One quarter of a mile from shore, a sounding showed 138 feet; five minutes later, 1,044 feet, gradually deepening to 1,308 feet. At 1,044 feet, water temperature was found to be 62°; at the surface immediately above, 76°; and at sixty feet, a cold stratum of 59°.

Upon arrival at 'Ain Turabeh arrangements were made for camels to haul the boats to the Mediterranean. On the following morning, May 6, a beginning was made in taking the copper boat apart. Dale and five men, with an assistant, were assigned to level up the pass, a work which was difficult, and consumed a number of days. On Sunday, May 7, the temperature in the shade at 8:30 a.m. stood at 106°. The next day at noon the temperature was 110°. By four o'clock that afternoon the leveling party had completed leveling the pass to the top of the mountain and three hundred feet into the desert, when high wind compelled them to stop.

On Tuesday, May 9, a large float, with an American flag flying, was moored in 480 feet of water at a distance from shore which would not permit the Arabs to molest it. The boats were now sent off in sections to Jaffa Gate in Jerusalem. Late in the evening, those who remained took a last bath in the Sea, and prepared to spend their twenty-second and last night on its shores. The entire Sea had been sounded; its geographical position determined; its exact topography charted; the temperature, width, depth, and velocity of its tributaries ascertained; and winds, currents, changes of the weather, and atmospheric phenomena noted. Lynch was strengthened in his opinion that the entire chasm had been sunk by some cataclysmic catastrophe. At the same time, he expressed regret that he had not been authorized to explore the southern *ghor* to the Red Sea. He suggested also, that "it is for the learned to comment on the facts we have laboriously collected."[15]

Final departure from the shore of the Sea was made on May 10, with arrival at Mar Saba in the afternoon of May 12. All hands enjoyed a rest on the 13th and 14th. Two more days of travel brought the party to Jerusalem where a camp was set up for six days in the Valley of Hinnom

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 371.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 380.

near Jaffa Gate, officers and men taking their turn in visiting the city and its environs.

On May 22, camp was broken, and with mules instead of camels, the expedition began to move toward the Mediterranean, leveling from a bench mark which had been made to the northwest of Jerusalem, and first carrying the line to the highest point in the vicinity, which was only a little less than four thousand feet above the surface of the Dead Sea. The route to Jaffa was *via* Nebi Samwil. At this stage of activity the only threatened difficulty was caused by a brother of the celebrated Abu Gosh who challenged the right of the expedition to cross his domain. When shown the firman, he still objected on the ground that the firman failed to mention the surveying of the route. Lynch's usual firmness obviated the difficulty. While passing the village, an elderly Arab called out: "O ye Muslims, come forth and see the Christians searching for treasures concealed by their forefathers in this country."[16]

Proceeding via Latrûn and Ramleh, the final level was taken on the edge of the Mediterranean, a mile and a half south of Jaffa. Lynch's statement summarizing this phase of the expedition reads as follows:

> The task was at length accomplished. We had carried a line of levels, with the spirit-level, from the chasm of the Dead Sea, through the Desert of Judea, over precipices and mountain-ridges, and down and across yawning ravines, and for much of the time beneath a scorching sun. It had been considered by many as impracticable. It has, however, been accomplished; and with as much accuracy as, I believe, it can be done. The instrument was a capital one of Troughton's, imported by Blunt. It was of the most recent construction, with staves to be read off by the observer. The adjustments of the instruments were frequently examined, and we were careful to make the observations as nearly mid-way as possible. The whole credit of this is due to Lieutenant Dale, to whom, in full confidence of his zeal and capacity, I assigned the task of levelling. The result is confirmatory of the skill and extraordinary accuracy of the triangulation of Lieutenant Symonds, R.N.[17]

The level of the Dead Sea had been found to be a little over thirteen hundred feet below sea level, and the elevation of Jerusalem, almost three times higher than the Dea Sea.

Seven days were spent in delightful quarters assigned by the American consular representative in Jaffa. One June 6, Dale started out with a land party for Acre. Lynch, with the remainder of the company, sailed on an Arab brig for the same destination.

On June 10, having sent Aulick, Bedlow, and three others to Beirut in charge of a seaman needing medical care on account of an accidental gunshot wound, Lynch started with the rest of his men for Nazareth. After a Sunday in Nazareth, the company continued to Mount Tabor and

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 434.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 434.

Semakh on the Sea of Galilee. A plan to explore the Sea of Galilee had to be abandoned when Lynch was informed that a boat being built on the Mediterranean would not be delivered for two weeks. It may be noted that Lynch rejected Robinson's identification of Khan Minyeh as Capernaum in favor of Tell Hum.

On June 14, the company continued northward to Lake Huleh, *via* the Jisr Benat Ya'kub, enjoying impressive views of Mount Hermon. On succeeding days, visits were paid to Tell el Qadi, Banias, the Ḥâṣbeya (one of the sources of the Jordan), and the valley of the Liṭâny.

With the arrival of information that the wounded seaman in Beirut was out of danger, the party started on the 19th for Damascus, and finally reached Beirut, *via* Baalbek, on June 30, with Lieutenant Dale, two seamen, and Lieutenant Lynch all sick and requiring medical attention. Here in the environs of Beirut the only tragic event of the entire expedition occurred. Lieutenant Dale, after lingering with a low, nervous fever, passed away on the evening of July 24, in spite of excellent medical care.

For some unexplained reason, the *Supply* failed to arrive in Beirut. On July 30 the physicians at Beirut advised Lynch to leave at once, since there was no hope for the recovery of the sick in Beirut. A small French brig was chartered to transport the metal boats, the other properties of the expedition, the body of Lieutenant Dale, and the remaining personnel to Malta. However, an unfortunate accident in the moving of the remains from shore to vessel, in addition to the superstitious fears of the French captain and his crew, compelled Lynch with great reluctance to bury the remains of Lieutenant Dale in Beirut.

A slow passage of thirty-eight days, with much sickness, exhaustion, and suffering from lack of food and water brought the company to Malta. On September 12 all were safely reëmbarked on the *Supply* with only three of the expedition ill, and early in December reached the western shore of the Atlantic. Another chapter in the scientific exploration of Palestine had been written.

Lynch served as a captain in the Confederate Navy, taking part in various naval actions on the Potomac, off North Carolina, and about Vicksburg. He died in Baltimore six months after the end of the war.

# PASTORAL AID FOR THE ABNORMAL

BERTRAM CROCKER

Washington, D. C.

RECENTLY a book[1] on pastoral counseling reached my desk. It contains much that is helpful and informative, as well as some that could prove thought-provoking. One paragraph, however, raised grave doubts and caused me to ask a series of great big *why's?* It touched upon the problem of homosexuality, and dismissed it in, what seemed to me, a smug and cowardly frame of mind: "Such a person should be referred to a psychiatrist for counsel. . . . Do not waste time and run risks as far as your own reputation is concerned in dealing with something you know nothing about. There are no exceptions in dealing with this problem. It is just not the pastor's problem."[2]

Perhaps all will agree that it is a matter of momentous degree. But will we agree that it is a matter that the Christian pastor should dodge? Probably our attitude will be determined by our individual interpretation of religion and its place in the life of man. Should we avoid a major difficulty for no better reason than consideration of our own reputations? Reputation is a very poor exchange for character. And if we need to fear for our reputation, why not avoid the liar, the drunkard, the fallen woman, the hypocrite, and the dozens of other "questionable" people who so desperately need our ministries from time to time?

Why send the abnormal to the psychiatrist? The Man of Galilee had a way of healing those who were sick in soul and mind. Are we, his ministers, nothing better than scripture peddlers, Sunday orators, pink-tea specialists, professional "blessing askers" (for people who never think of saying grace except when the minister comes to dinner)? Is sprinkling a few drops of water on a baby's head, or immersing an adult, the most important of our ministerings? We amount to very little, unless we are able, by the grace of him who called us, to do something very real for those who are sick in soul—in mind. Are we just contemporary bunk-shooters, having nothing real to give? Or have we the answer and the healing for our fretful, strained, soul-sick generation?

It was the writer's privilege to serve as an army chaplain for two years. Much of that time was spent on convoy duty and in great replacement depots in the Southwest Pacific. While stationed on the home soil, getting familiar with things military, I often wondered if my ministry was making a worth-while contribution, for, much of the time, it seemed

[1] Russell L. Dicks, *Personal Work and Pastoral Counseling,* Macmillan, 1944.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 99.

my major duty was to listen to gripes and tales of woe and to avoid doing anything about it—for in due time most things are supposed to have a way of taking care of themselves. In short, I was to endeavor to excel in the art of passing the buck, and soften it all with a verse of scripture.

But overseas it was a far different matter. At the replacement depot we received the boys a few hours after they had landed. Confused, bewildered, disgusted, weary boys they were, too—but with the most refreshing sense of humor—and with it all a very real sense of the seriousness of the work they had to do. *Their* contact with the chaplain usually was the outcome of concern about mail from home.

Then, too, every day or so we received groups—sometimes large, sometimes small—from New Guinea. Usually, they had just been released from some field hospital (mostly malarial cases) and had come to us for reclassification. *Their* problems usually concerned the possibility of getting sick leave and sufficient back pay to enable them to spend a week or so at an Australian city such as Brisbane, Sydney, or Melbourne.

From time to time large outfits came to us. They were being relieved after long periods in the actual fighting zones. THEY HAD PROBLEMS. Many of them had not seen a woman for a year or more. That condition affected them in various ways. Some, upon receiving leave and money, made a beeline for Mrs. Warren's establishments—many of whom soon afterwards were patients in what the doctors called "The Romance Wards." Some said that they had lost the sensations of sexual desires. Others, for various reasons or for no reason at all, had resorted, in widely varying degrees, to practices considered abnormal. It was among this group that, for the first time in my life, I found myself thinking seriously about and discussing the problems of homosexuality.

During my college classes in psychology and sociology I had been guided toward a "tolerant attitude." I soon discovered, however, that such was little better than pharisaism, for down deep in my heart I had a very smug idea of the sinfulness of it all. But sitting in a tent or in an improvised chapel, looking into the face of a boy while he told his story, I became impressed with the fact that there were aspects far more important than the question of guilt. While the surgeon is extracting a bullet, he cannot afford to be overly concerned about whether or not the patient is a lawbreaker. So must it be with the physician of the soul.

Most of the boys who talked of this particular problem told their stories with obvious embarrassment. Some spoke with a sense of shame. One cried bitterly.

The author of the book to which I referred says, "Send him to a psychiatrist."

That was just what I did to one boy—and I consider it the major

mistake of my ministerial career. Perhaps it was just unfortunate that the particular psychiatrist happened to be too definitely Freudian. Anyway, instead of being helped, the soldier suffered more. Instead of being led to a feeling of inner cleanliness, sex—Sex—SEX was emphasized, and emphasized, and emphasized until that man lost even the desire to live. He had been made to feel vile and filthy. Not even the clumsiest, most arrogant parson could have done a worse job of bungling. And a Christian minister was largely to blame, because he had lost—or perhaps never had had—the necessary faith and intimate knowledge of the Man of Galilee. He expected Freud to be a Christian boy's Messiah.

On another occasion, when I consulted a psychiatrist regarding a soldier, I was told in no uncertain terms that nothing could be done for *that* type. What good is that type of psychiatry? As a Christian minister, I believe that *something* can be done for *everyone,* and my conviction is that that very sentiment runs throughout the teachings of the Minister from Nazareth.

The writer of the book makes a somewhat similar statement—and adds: "There are no exceptions." That is a tragic error to make. There *are* exceptions, for I am convinced that many of the boys acquired the so-called "abnormal" tendencies in their abnormal surroundings, just as they acquired other habits that would be considered bad at home. Some gave reasons—and even hoped—for a word of justification. Frankly, they were not reasons that would satisfy even themselves under normal conditions. But, with the warped perspective of their surroundings, the reasons seemed logical enough.

Psychologically, the very fact that a man approaches a minister or doctor for help is full proof that he can be helped, and if the one to whom he appeals happens to be his own pastor, then that pastor should be competent and ready to help him. How? There is no one and only way. Perhaps such an assumption is the secret of so much of the hysteria that Freudian psychiatry is creating among our emotionally sick soldiers. Far too often, men of varying temperaments are asked the prescribed questions as though the chart rather than the man were of utmost importance.

One boy was helped simply by making it possible for him to come to the chaplain's office whenever he desired. He was allowed to talk freely —and in the assurance that his confidence would never, under any circumstances, be betrayed. He talked most freely after dark, in the glow of a wood fire in the rude stove. The chaplain's reputation? If some people had known, they probably would have talked. But that would be of secondary importance. An emotionally sick boy was helped.

To another boy, prayer was suggested. Oh, not the type of prayer that is strangely like a child crying for the star off the Christmas tree.

But rather like the type implied by the minister in *How Green Was My Valley* when he said words to the effect that prayer is right thinking. That kind of prayer *has* changed men's lives. All who have tried it know. Yet another was guided to a technique of substitute thought along the lines of Paul's admonition, "Whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely . . . think on these things."

Just how permanent the results were I will never know. But I do know this: The simple sayings of the Carpenter of Nazareth had a very real therapeutic value for the men who were paying one of the most grave prices of war. And out of the many heartaches of my experiences in the Southwest Pacific there stands a certain morning when a soldier said, "Chappie, everything's changed! I'm all clean inside."

No, Brother Minister, don't dodge your responsibility. Don't pass on an important part of our glorious ministry to a group of hirelings. Most of these boys, please God, are coming back home. They are going to need your help in problems that will amaze you. And your reputation? Forget it. Be content with character. Get more intimately acquainted with your New Testament. That Carpenter Man is still æons ahead of Freud. Supplement his sayings with the wealth of material being written by religious psychologists. There are many of them. But get yourself ready for a ministry that is real.

# SOME CONTEMPORARY MOSLEM INTERPRETATIONS OF THE BIBLE

CHARLES S. BRADEN
Northwestern University

THIS article does not attempt to deal with the Bible in the Koran. That has been done often and well. It is a matter of common knowledge that Mohammed made a very considerable use of Jewish-Christian scriptural material. The names of many Old and New Testament worthies are almost as familiar to the followers of the prophet as they are to Jews and Christians. Entire monographs have appeared dealing with this subject. The problem of just what acquaintance Mohammed had with the Bible has been discussed by more than one Islamic scholar, and varying views have been expressed.

The present article is limited to the comparatively recent period and concerns itself only with the interpretation and use of the Bible by Moslems in our own day. Since the major use of the Bible has been made by that group of Moslems who are attempting to expand through the western world, the Ahmadiyas, most of the material used in the paper comes from Ahmadiya sources. Since they are seeking to teach Islam in lands where the Bible is revered, they feel they must find an approach to the people through the Bible. And since most of those Moslems take an attitude toward their own scripture like that of the extreme conservatives among Jews and Christians, they deal with the Bible very much as do the conservatives, that is, they make much use of proof texts which are capable of bearing an interpretation favorable to their own ways of thinking—and this, interestingly enough, while specifically denying that the Bible is the word of God, as we shall see presently. They deliberately seek in the Bible words and phrases which can be interpreted as foreshadowing the prophet or some other aspect of Moslem faith.

There is in process of publication a series of booklets on *Mohammed in Ancient Scriptures* written by U. Ali and published by S. and R. Brothers, Agra, India. The first volume deals with Buddhist prophecies which the writer believes find their fulfillment in the person of Mohammed, but incidentally contain material bearing upon the Bible.

As is well known to all Buddhist scholars, Buddhists look forward to the coming of another Buddha whose name they give as Maitreya. This volume purports to identify Mohammed as the expected Maitreya. The reasons given for the identification are very interesting. Apparently it occurred to the writer that two other identifications might be made,

and he is at considerable pains to refute these and establish Mohammed as the correct one. One possible identification was Shankara Charya, the other, Jesus. We are particularly interested here in the reason why Jesus is not to be considered the proper equivalent of Maitreya, for this involves some Moslem use of Christian scripture, though mainly for negative reasons. The first of the reasons alleged is that Jesus never asserted that he was the fulfillment of the prophecy. Second, the character of Jesus does not display the ten perfections. Third, Jesus died by violence upon the cross, which is contrary to the Buddhist view which declares it improper "that one should deprive the Tathagata of life by violence." According to the Buddhists there are six criteria for identifying a Buddha. These are: first, that Buddha attained superior insight at nighttime; second, on the occasion of enlightenment he looks exceedingly bright; third, he dies a natural death; fourth, he dies at nighttime; fifth, he looks exceedingly bright before his death; and sixth, after his death a Buddha ceases to exist on earth. Mr. Ali then proceeds to cite a great many scripture verses to show that Jesus fulfills none of these criteria. The baptism (Matt. 3:16-17) was clearly performed in daytime. Again, there is no record in the gospels to show that Jesus "looked exceedingly bright" at the time of his baptism.[1] Once more, according to the gospels, "Jesus did not die a natural death but was deprived of his life by his enemies in the prime of life."[2] This is rather interesting in view of the claim of the Ahmadiyas and other Moslems that Jesus did not die on the cross. Fourth, he shows by the gospel record that Jesus was killed not at nighttime but in the daytime. Fifth, "There is no mention that Jesus looked exceedingly bright and beautiful above expression on the night before his crucifixion."[3] Finally, according to the gospel story Jesus was seen a number of times on earth after his death. In proof of this latter he cites a dozen gospel references.

Unfortunately the volume showing how Mohammed is found in the Christian scriptures either has not yet appeared or was not available to the writer.

Other marks of the Buddha are set forth in a second volume. Here it is said that a Buddha must be a human being. This, on the basis of the Christian claim, which, for purposes of argument, seems here to be accepted, renders it impossible that Jesus could be the Buddha. A Buddha must be a male. Why then might not Jesus qualify here? The explanation offered is an interesting one.

> The Hebrews married early, about the fourteenth year. Why Jesus remained a bachelor up to the age of thirty-three seems strange. Probably he had become a

[1] U. Ali, *Mohammed in Ancient Scriptures* (S. and R. Brothers, Agra, India), p. 61.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 62. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

eunuch for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. He taught his elect disciples to follow his example. Matthew 19:12 "There are some eunuchs which were so born from their mother's womb. There are some eunuchs that were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs that have made themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake." In order to follow the example and precept of the master in letter and spirit, a number of zealous Christians have castrated themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake. Their condition is justified by the precept of the master. Mark 9:43-48, "and if thy hand offend thee, cut it off, etc." "It is better for thee to enter into the Kingdom of God with one eye than with two eyes to be cast into hell fire." The sex organ being the cause of many sins, some of the zealous Christians in the light of the above saw fit to castrate themselves.[4]

As is well known, the Arabs trace their lineage back to Abraham just as do the Hebrews, the latter through the line of Isaac, the former through Ishmael. When Hagar and Ishmael were sent away into the desert, they were about to die of thirst when the child, kicking the ground, uncovered a stream of clear water which gushed forth from the earth. This is identified with the well Zem Zem, the famous sacred well in Mecca. In the Bible story Ishmael is the castoff son of a slave girl while Isaac is the son of the honored wife Sarah. According to Moslem interpretation the story is quite different, as it has recently been set forth in a life of Mohammed for western readers by a Mohammedan missionary.[5]

The story differs at a number of points. In the first place, Hagar was "not a mere handmaid of Sarah as the Israelites have represented her to be."[6] According to Gen. 16:10-11, Hagar, the mother, "received glad tidings of God that a son would be born unto her [Hagar] that would be called Ishmael." "And the angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude, and the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold thou art with child, and thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the Lord hath heard thy affliction.[7] The very word *Ishmael,* he points out, means "God heard," signifying "that Abraham had addressed incessant imploring and entreaties to God to bless him with a son and that God had granted his request."[8] Moreover, of Ishmael, God had said, "And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee. Behold I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, . . . and twelve princes will he beget and I will make him a great nation" (Gen. 17:20). The very care which God showed for the child Ishmael upholds the belief, says Mr. Bengalee, "that Hagar's son was

[4] *Op. cit.,* Vol. II, pp. 10-11.

[5] Sufi M. R. Bengalee, *Life of Muhammad,* Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, 1941. I have followed American usage in the spelling of the prophet's name, *viz.,* Mohammed; but in direct quotations have preserved the variant, *Muhammad,* regularly used by Arabic and Continental authors. [The quoted sections evidence frequent idiosyncrasies as to capitalization, spelling, punctuation, and, at times, normal syntax. The reader will recognize them as due to the author's fidelity to his sources, not to his lack of care.—The Editor.]

[6] *Ibid.,* p. 8. [7] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

[8] *Ibid.,* pp. 8, 9.

something more than a mere handmaid's son and that God was with Ishmael."[9] Thus the forebears of the Islamic people acquired a status equal to that of their Hebrew brethren.

A second point of difference is that Ishmael, not Isaac, is represented as being offered by Abraham as sacrifice. A number of reasons are given for holding this view. They are listed by Mr. Bengalee as follows:

> First: Ishmael was born according to promise in answer to Abraham's supplication. Second: That the word Ishmael, which God admonished Hagar to name her son, means "God heard." Third: That according to the old Law the first born was always offered for sacrifice, and Biblical history proves that Ishmael was fourteen years older than Isaac. Fourth and lastly: This day is commemorated among the Moslems in memory of Hagar and Ishmael and the great sacrifice.[10]

An entire chapter in Mr. Bengalee's recent book is given the title "Muhammad in the Bible," the purpose being to show "the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy in Muhammad, the founder of Islam."[11] Before citing particulars in support of his view, the author is at considerable pains to assert that Moslems do not accept the Bible as the inspired word of God, chiefly because the transmission has played so many tricks with what may have been originally intended. After pointing out this weakness of the scriptures, he does, nevertheless, hold that the Bible

> contains many beautiful truths and many untruths as well, many words of God (by no means literal) and many inconsistencies, discrepancies and contradictions. Of the words of God and truth contained in the Bible, there certainly are many prophecies, a number of which have been fulfilled in the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad.[12]

We shall have occasion a little later to speak again of the Moslem conception of Christian scriptures.

One of the prophecies that seems definitely to point toward Mohammed is Deut. 18:18-19: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." Contained in this verse are four specific signs by which Mr. Bengalee purports to recognize and identify the prophet. First, "The prophet will be raised from among their brethren." Now who were their brethren? It is of common knowledge that Abraham had two sons, Isaac and Ishmael. Since the descendants of Ishmael would be the brethren of the descendants of Isaac, it appears that the prophet was to be "like unto thee," meaning, of course, like unto Moses. Since Moses was a lawbringer and a prophet, the expected prophet must be also a lawbringer and a prophet. Third, it is said, "He shall speak

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 10, 11.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 262.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 265.

unto them all that I shall command him." "In other words," says the Islamic writer, "the prophet will not speak from himself but will transmit to the people all that God will command him to speak."[13] Fourth, the declaration, "whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him," shows that the prophet will "speak unto the people the words of God in the name of God.[14] Do not these four signs indicate clearly the prophet Mohammed? For he was born of the descendants of Ishmael or the brethren of the children of Israel; he was a prophet; and he came with a new law given to us in the holy Koran. None of the prophets, including Jesus, brought a new law or dispensation, says the author; while it is certain that Mohammed was both a prophet and a lawgiver who did bring a new dispensation, for as the Koran itself says, "We have raised a prophet among you like unto the prophet that we sent unto Pharaoh."[15] Now did Mohammed speak anything from himself or did he speak only the word of God? The Koran says he [Mohammed] "speaks nought from himself; verily it is the word of God that came unto him."[16] And again, "only the words of God came unto me [Mohammed]."[17] And as to the fourth, nearly every one of the suras of the Koran begins with the words, "In the name of God, the merciful, the compassionate." Thus the prophecy can relate only to the prophet of Arabia. Those who have sought to apply this prophecy to Jesus have done so erroneously, for "It has been plainly meant in the New Testament[18] that the prophet like unto Moses would appear after the advent of Jesus." Thus, concludes the author, "the prophecy in the passage under discussion has come to pass in the minutest detail in the person of the Holy founder of Islam."[19]

A second prophecy is found in Deut. 33:2: "And he said, the Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them." How does this relate to the prophet Mohammed? "Coming from Sinai" refers of course to Moses; "rising up from Seir" alludes to the coming of Jesus, but it was the prophet Mohammed who shined forth from Mount Paran, thinks Mr. Bengalee, since Paran "is the ancient name of the part of Arabia where the children of Ishmael, the ancestors of Muhammad, settled."[20] Whether Mount Paran is to be thus located is a moot question. The author quotes some authorities which support his conclusion. Thus Jacut's *Geographisches Wörterbuch* (F. Wustenfeld, Leipzig, 1862, Vol. III, p. 834) declares that *Faran,* which is the Arabian form of the word *Paran* or *Pharan,* is the name of Mecca and that it is also applied to the mountains of Mecca. The

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 267. [14] *Ibid.*, p. 267. [15] *Koran* 73:15.
[16] *Koran* 53:3-4. [17] *Koran* 18:110. [18] *Acts* 3:18-26.
[19] Bengalee, *op. cit.*, pp. 268, 269. [20] *Ibid.*, p. 269.

word *Faran* seems to be the Arabic *farr an* which means "two refugees." "It appears that the place takes its name from Hagar and Ishmael who came there as refugees."[21] Driver[22] says, "The data at our disposal do not enable us to fix with confidence the locality intended." The last clauses of the prophecy, "he came with ten thousands of saints," and "from his right hand went a fiery law for them," point unmistakably to Mohammed, says the author, for at the time of the conquest of Mecca ten thousand holy men followed at his heels, and he was the bearer of the Koran. "Hence, the prophecy has been wonderfully fulfilled in the person of Muhammad."[23]

The third prophecy is found in Isa. 21:13-17 which begins, "The burden upon Arabia." Thus the scene of the prophecy is actually where the prophet Mohammed appeared. "The inhabitants of the land of Tema brought water to him that was thirsty, they prevented with their bread him that fled." Now Mohammed's flight marked the official beginning of the Moslem calendar. Therefore Mohammed is indicated in the prophecy: "for they fled . . . from the drawn sword, and from the bent bow, and from the grievousness of war." This, says the author, "conclusively proves the fulfillment of the prophecy in the prophet of Arabia, for Muhammad fled from Mecca while his house was surrounded by his deadly enemies who stood there, drawn swords in hands, thirsty for his blood."[24] "Within a year . . . all the glory of Kedar shall fail, . . . the mighty men of . . . Kedar shall diminish." This, says the writer, "was fulfilled in the battle of Badr which occurred within a year from the flight of Muhammad from Mecca." Further in this battle the Quraish of Mecca, which the author identifies with Kedar, "sustained a crushing defeat; most of their mighty men were killed."[25] Is Kedar the same as Mecca? Identification of sites is a peculiarly difficult problem in this part of the world. Driver locates it thus, "The home of Nebaioth was probably somewhere E. of Edom, Kedar being still further to the E., in the desert."[26] Mr. Bengalee quotes *The Historical Geography of Arabia* by C. Forster as substantiating his identification. I am unable myself to pass judgment upon the merits of the case. It is interesting that the Mohammedans make this particular identification since it serves so well their purpose.

One other Old Testament passage is brought forward, this time from the Song of Solomon 5:9-16, which he says describes the beloved of God. "My beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand. . . . Yea, he is altogether lovely." The striking thing about this passage is that in the phrase "he is altogether lovely," the original Hebrew

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 269. [22] *ICC Deut.*, p. 391.
[23] Bengalee, *op. cit.*, p. 270. [24] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 271.
[26] S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, p. 242.

has a word closely resembling Mohammed, מַחְמַדִּים, which transliterated, says Mr. Bengalee, is Mohammad-im.[27]

This interpretation is supported by the further consideration of the use of the term "beloved," for Mohammed has as one of his titles *Habibullah*, the friend or beloved of God; and by the description of the beloved as "white and ruddy," for "this was exactly the color of Muhammad. Take any biography of Muhammad, and you will find that this Biblical description has been literally fulfilled in him."[28] Likewise the epithet, "chiefest among ten thousand," fits perfectly the Arabian prophet since "Muhammad was at the head of ten thousand followers at the time of the conquest of Mecca. How clearly the prophecy has been fulfilled in Muhammad."[29]

The same writer has a very interesting interpretation of the passages relating to the coming of the Comforter which Jesus promises in John 14:25-27 and identifies with the Holy Ghost, "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, . . ." But this is clearly contradicted, Mr. Bengalee says, in 16:7, where Jesus declares, ". . . if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you," for

> Herein Jesus says that his going away, i.e., the death of Jesus, is inevitably necessary for the coming of the Comforter. But it is a matter of common knowledge that the Holy Ghost was co-existing with Jesus. This proves that the Comforter was some one other than the Holy Ghost. This also strongly supports our assertion that there have been many interpolations in the existing Christian Bible.[30]

If the Comforter is not the Holy Ghost, then to whom is reference here made? The phrase, "he will guide you into all truth,"[31] provides the clue to its understanding, for

> Muhammad was the only prophet who claimed to have brought the universal law. To him was revealed the Holy Quran which guides mankind to all truth. The Holy Quran says: "Today We have perfected your religion for you and completed our favors upon you."
>
> It is said that the Comforter would not speak himself but "Whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak. . . ."
>
> Muhammad spoke naught of himself—he spoke only what he heard. He was the mouthpiece of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate. Through him, "the Spirit of Truth" did reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment.
>
> As had been foretold by Jesus, Muhammad did glorify Jesus. In short, the prophecy of the Comforter has been literally fulfilled in its minutest details in Muhammad.[32]

[27] Pp. 272-273. He cites as his authority the "Hebrew Bible printed for the British and Foreign Bible Society by Trowitzsch and Son, Berlin, page 1159." A more nearly correct transliteration is Machmaddim.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 272.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 272. [30] *Ibid.*, p. 277. [31] John 16:9.

[32] Bengalee, *op. cit.*, pp. 277, 278.

One further passage from Rev. 19: 10-11 is also interpreted as clearly foreshadowing Mohammed. He writes:

"Heaven open" shows that Heaven is the scene of the prophecy. This has been fulfilled in the famous spiritual journey (vision) of Muhammad.

"And a white horse" is a further testimony of the fact that the prophecy has been fulfilled in Muhammad. The well-known Burak—that Muhammad sat upon in his spiritual journey of vision—was white in color.

The prophecy mentions that the one who sat upon the white horse would be called "The Faithful and the True." This settles the question beyond the shadow of a doubt that the master-prophet Muhammad fulfilled the prophecy. It was he who was distinguished by the name of Al-Ameen, The Faithful and True.

Therefore, the foregoing references conclusively prove that the Biblical prophecy was splendidly fulfilled by the advent of the Holy Prophet Muhammad.[33]

Dr. H. M. Sadiq in an article, "Some Bible Prophecies Fulfilled in Islam,"[34] includes several of those already cited from other sources. He adds two other interesting ones. In John 1: 19-20 the priests and Levites sent to John to ask him who he was. He declared categorically, "I am not the Christ." "What then," they asked, "are you, Elias?" and again he said, "I am not." Then they asked, "Art thou *that prophet?*" This shows, according to the author, that the Jews were looking for three persons to come. According to the declaration of Jesus he says: "John the Baptist was Elias, Jesus himself was the Christ. But the question still remains: who was that Prophet mentioned in Deuteronomy 18: 18? Indeed he was none other than The Master-Prophet Muhammad who in Muslim literature is called An Nabi—'That prophet.'"

Again in Isa. 21: 7 the prophet sees in a vision a chariot with horses, a chariot with asses, and one with camels. These, asserts the writer, show the "three Great Prophets with a sign of their national way of riding respectively. The horseman is Moses, the rider of the ass is Jesus, and the rider of the camel is the Master-Prophet Muhammad, as the camel is the chief animal of conveyance in Arabia."[35]

In an article in the *Review of Religions,* Maulvi Muhammad Din, onetime missionary in Chicago, writes on the "Muslim Attitude towards Christian Scriptures." At the same time he reveals what the typical Moslem view of the scripture is. He says:

The Muslim believes in pre-Islamic revelation but he does not believe that the Christian Bible is the actual Word of God. That this revelation has been manipulated to a degree or in some cases utterly lost does in no way imply that there was no revelation. He still believes that Jesus or Moses were the direct recipients of divine revelation. What he contends is that the so-called Christian Scriptures, especially the

[33] *Ibid.,* p. 279.
[34] *Extracts from the Holy Quran,* seventh edition compiled and published by Abdullah Allahadin, Secunderabad, India, p. 325.
[35] *Ibid.,* p. 326.

New Testament, do not deserve the title of revealed or inspired Scriptures *per se*. And he has his justification.[36]

By Scripture the Muslim understands the revelation that descends upon the prophets which they and their followers are bound to follow. It is mostly the verbal inspiration that flows upon the recipient in a state of passivity when all other outer faculties are held in abeyance. Revelation alone can make a recipient immune from error, for it suspends for the time being all mental activity of the person upon whom the Word of God descends.[37]

The Muslim attitude is well summed up by the Holy Quran in the following words: "Woe to those who write the manuscripts with their own hands and then ascribe them to a divine origin so that they might obtain therewith a small gain; therefore woe to them for what their hands have written and woe to them for what they have earned.[38]

Christians should therefore understand that it is not merely this or that verse that is objectionable in the Muslim eye; it is the whole mass of the so-called Christian Scriptures that fall under the condemned category. The Muslim absolutely rejects their inspired or revealed character. He just regards them as story books half historical and half legendary with no pretension to divine authority.[39]

There is not a shred of evidence to prove that any of the so-called Christian Scriptures is of a revealed nature as revelation is understood in the religious sense. There is nothing of inspiration, much less of revelation, about them. They are man-made things written with diverse motives. And last of all, the attitude of the Holy Quran towards them is absolutely correct and justified by facts, that is, some people took to writing books and pamphlets, published them anonymously, dedicated and attributed them to this or that disciple of Jesus to give them a sacred character, and thus foisted these books upon the ignorant masses as the very Word of God. The writers had their ulterior motives which they try to conceal, but despite themselves these find expressions here and there.[40]

In the *Moslem Sunrise* Maulvi Muhammad Din writes concerning a misinterpretation of certain gospel passages by a Mormon writer who made them prophesy the coming of Joseph Smith. Not so, asserts the Moslem. Those scriptures refer rather to the coming of the Arabian prophet.

The first passage was the story of the vineyard, where the master rewards those hired at the eleventh hour with the same wage he gave to those who came earlier. Of this fifth group he remarks:

It is interesting to study the fifth group. On being asked by the householder as to why they had been standing idle the whole day long, they say, "Because no man hath hired us." Now this question is not preferred [*sic*] to the previous groups neither is there any answer by them recorded. Therefore the last group stands unique in this respect that they had been discarded. Now history shows us that it is Ishmael and his descendants who had been ostracised and deprived of their due share of the Abrahamic inheritance and blessings owing to the jealousy of the Sons of Isaac —the Jews and the Christians. Hence they stood to be compensated in the divine

[36] *Review of Religions*, Vol. XXX (Dec., 1931), p. 299.
[37] *Ibid.*
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 302. [39] *Ibid.*, p. 303.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 308.

scheme of things, and this is the lesson which Jesus wanted to impress upon his audience as we shall show further on.

Even if we take it as a new covenant, it does not at all apply to Joseph Smith, for he claims to be the servant of Jesus, and therefore as such neither he nor his people claim any superiority to Jesus or his disciples. Nay, they cannot even be treated on a plane of equality, for a disciple cannot be greater than his master, just as Jesus says it. It must refer to a covenant which can claim equality with all, and that is Islam which supersedes all previous covenants. It is moreover received through a man who belonged to a nation whom nobody would hire. The fifth group then is the group of Moslems who through the Grace and Mercy of God are put upon the same level—aye a higher level—than their predecessors. "The stone which the masons rejected the same is become the head of the corner." It is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes.[41]

The same writer, Muhammad Din, also takes the story of the vineyard told in Matt. 21 : 33-46 as pointing not to Joseph but to Mohammed. Here the owner lets his vineyard to a husbandman. Later he sends to collect his share, but they beat and stoned and killed the servants sent to collect. Finally he sent his son, and they killed him also. Then comes the prophecy: "He will miserably destroy them. . . . The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. . . . Therefore I say the kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof."

The reference of this to Mohammed is clear, he thinks:

From the drift of the passage as well as from the general tenor of Jesus' teaching it is apparent the discarded stone cannot but be the Ishmaelites, the brothers of the Jews, of whom Moses had said that God would raise a Prophet from among them like unto himself.[42]

In the whole of the twenty-third chapter, Jesus is trying to teach his disciples the value of works while he exposes the hollowness of the Pharisaical creed. He says in effect at the very beginning, "The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works: for they say, and do not." At the end of the chapter he gives the warning which I have given above: "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."[43]

Herein again Jesus speaks of the coming of one who is greater than himself, . . . It is clear that these prophecies refer to the coming of the Holy Prophet of Arabia, and to nobody else, and it is time that our Christian friends turned to the truth, for without Islam they would all be groping in the dark.[44]

The kingdom of heaven was to be taken away from the Jews and given to another nation who bore some kinship to the Jews, and whose right to the inheritance could be proved from the divine instrument, tampered though it had been, yet traces and clues could with certainty be found therein still. . . .

To make it still more clear Jesus says that "whosoever shall fall on that stone shall be broken; but on whomsoever it shall fall it will grind him to powder." It is

[41] *Moslem Sunrise*, Vol. II, p. 258.
[42] *Ibid.*, p. 259. [43] *Ibid.*, pp. 260, 261. [44] *Ibid.*, p. 261.

evident that in no case is it applicable to Prophet Joseph Smith. It is to Muhammad alone among a whole line of prophets that such a marvellous success was vouchsafed. He who stood in his way was removed and whosoever he fell upon was literally crushed to pieces. Even mighty monarchies that stood in his way were swept away. "It is the Lord's doing indeed," and, "it is marvellous in our eyes."[45]

Sufi M. R. Bengalee interprets the passage in question in the same general fashion, but his explanation is somewhat different. He holds that Jesus was the son who was sent and maltreated and put on the cross, thus clearly fulfilling the prophecy. But what of the remaining passage, "What therefore shall the Lord of the vineyard do unto them? He will come and destroy these husbandmen and shall give the vineyard to others"? Mr. Bengalee interprets it thus:

It must be noted that the coming of the Lord can only mean the coming of a prophet. The advent of a prophet has been metaphorically called the coming of the Lord as he would appear as the greatest manifestation of the glory, power and the attributes of God. In other words, a prophecy concerning the appearance of a great prophet has been made in the concluding verses of the famous parable of Jesus. It cannot be applied to Jesus for the obvious reason that the coming of Jesus has been called the coming of the beloved son of the Lord whereas the appearance of this prophet has been described as the appearance of the Lord Himself after the death of the son, as the words of the parable clearly indicate.[46]

"Shall give the vineyard to others" is the real key to the interpretation of the prophecy. Who are "the others"? Bringing into juxtaposition Matt. 21:43 where Jesus declares, "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," it is clearly to go not to *the nations, i.e.,* the gentiles in general, but to *a nation.* What can this mean other than the nation which Mohammed founded? So says the writer:

The prophecy has been clearly fulfilled in the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He came as the manifestation of the glory, power and attributes of God thus fulfilling the words, "The Lord will come." He came not from among the children of Israel but from among the children of Ishmael and fulfilled the words, "shall give the vineyard to others" and "The kingdom of God will be given to another nation." Muhammad came after the death of Jesus and the words of God that the Lord will come after His son would be killed came true.[47]

Muhammad Ali, in the *Religion of Islam,* declares categorically that the Kaaba, the sacred shrine in Mecca, was rebuilt by Abraham, and he asserts that the black stone which pilgrims to the shrine kiss as they perform their pilgrimage,

stands there only as an emblem, a token that that part of the progeny of Abraham which was rejected by the Israelites was to become the cornerstone of the Kingdom

[45] *Ibid.,* p. 260.
[46] *The Life of Muhammad,* p. 274. [47] *Ibid.*

of God.[48] Ishmael was looked upon as rejected and the divine covenant was considered to have been made with the children of Isaac only. . . . While prophet after prophet appeared among the Israelites no prophet appeared among the progeny of Ishmael . . . yet it was from the progeny of Ishmael that the Last Prophet, the headstone of the corner was to arise and the Black Stone was placed as the corner of the Kaaba as a sign that the rejected Ishmaelites were the real inheritors of the divine kingdom. . . . In the whole world there is only this unhewn stone "cut out of the mountain without hands"[49] that is, the cornerstone of a building which in point of importance stands unique in the world.[50]

Another use of biblical material by the Ahmadiya Moslems is with reference to Jesus who, they claim, did not die on the cross but escaped and went eastward to Kashmir in the northwest section of India where he spent the remainder of his long life, died, and was buried in a tomb at Srinagar, which is pointed out today as the tomb of Jesus. Sufi M. R. Bengalee has published a small brochure which gives the evidence for this belief. He writes:

According to the Ahmadiya belief, Jesus did not die on the cross.

When taken down from the cross, he was still alive in a state of unconsciousness. He was rescued from the sepulchre by his close friends and followers. Medicine was administered to his wounds, and having been restored to health, he made a long trip to Cashmere and died a natural death there at a ripe old age. The picture on page two is that of his tomb, which is situated at Khan Yar Street, Srinagar, Cashmere, India.[51]

The first biblical passage used to substantiate the belief is Matt. 12: 39-40, "for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." This prophecy, the writer asserts, can be said to have come true only if Jesus enters and leaves the sepulchre alive, thus proving that Jesus cannot have died, and therefore that he may very well then have gone elsewhere to spend his remaining days: "The fulfillment of the prophecy demands that Jesus escape the accursed death on the cross, and enters into and comes out of the sepulchre alive." Furthermore, the prayer of Jesus in Gethsemane, "Let this cup pass from me if it be possible," and his cry on the cross "My God, My God, Why hast thou forsaken me?" furnish us, he thinks,

with a strong evidence that Jesus was saved from death on the cross. For it is utterly unbelievable that such earnest prayers from no less a personage than Jesus Christ should go unanswered. Even St. Paul bears us out in *this* contention when in Hebrews 5:7 he says, "When he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared."[52]

[48] Psalm 118: 22. [49] Dan. 2: 45. [50] M. Ali, *Religion of Islam*, pp. 536-537.
[51] M. R. Bengalee, *The Tomb of Jesus*, Moslem Sunrise Press, Chicago, p. 3.
[52] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

Death on the cross is an accursed death, he says, citing Deut. 21:23, "For he that is hanged is accursed of God." "How could Jesus," he continues, "an honored, beloved and chosen prophet of God die an accursed death—a punishment inflicted upon thieves and malefactors? It follows, therefore, that God would save him from such a punishment."[53] A further proof that Jesus was not dead when taken down from the cross was the fact, that when (John 19:34) one of the soldiers "pierced his side, . . . forthwith there came out blood and water." But, declares the writer, "Blood never comes out of a dead body. The oozing of blood is a sure indication and a conclusive proof of the fact that Jesus was still alive.[54]

Of course he quotes the various stories of Jesus' postresurrection appearances where he asks them to handle him and see, "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones," and where he ate broiled fish.[55] And Paul is appealed to as further evidence against the physical ascension when he says: ". . . flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."[56] Therefore on scriptural grounds Jesus must not have died on the cross. If not, where did he go? In the story of the Syrophœnician woman Jesus had said "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."[57] Who are these lost sheep? Who but the lost tribes of Israel who disappeared at the time of the fall of Samaria? They were the *lost* sheep. And where are they? They have been found in almost every quarter of the globe, but the Ahmadiya writers are sure that they are the inhabitants of Kashmir. Mr. Bengalee cites not a little alleged evidence, which is not relevant to this discussion, to support their view. Enough that they believe that Jesus did not die as believed but went seeking the lost sheep and came to Kashmir where he finished his career. If one were to take account of the Moslem use of the Bible in disproving the various claims of Christianity, he could greatly multiply the number of references. One sample must here suffice, one refuting the Christian claim as to the deity of Christ.

After quoting various verses from the gospels—"Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" (Mark 12:29); "My father is greater than I" (John 14:28); "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God" (Matt. 19:17); "I cast out devils by the finger of God" (Luke 11:20—omitting "if"); "I came not to judge the world" (John 12:47); "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John 17:3)—one Moslem editor writes:

> In the face of such clear admissions on the part of Jesus, son of Mary, peace be on him, it is really wonderful how the Christians dare to call him God and invent and impute to him such attributes which are quite contrary to his words and teachings.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 5. [54] *Ibid.* [55] Luke 24:39, 42.
[56] I Cor. 15:50. [57] Matt. 15:23, 24.

It is all the more surprising that such an impossible belief can be entertained even for a moment in these times of enlightenment when education and common sense is the deciding factor in human affairs.[58]

Many other like interpretations could be cited, but surely enough have been brought together to give a good idea of the way Moslems regard Christian scriptures and how they interpret them. The most obvious characteristic of their use of the Bible is the proof text method, in which they differ very little if at all from the method used by those Christians who hold the more conservative view of the Bible. Much that has appeared in the article has a familiar ring, save that it is applied to Mohammed. One cannot help wondering how Christians, whose general methods the Moslems thus employ, look upon the conclusions which they reach.

[58] *Extracts from the Holy Quran*, pp. 111-112. (See Note 34.)

# Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

MANY years ago a friend, then in his seventies, remarked of his wife: "I suppose that she has faults, but I do not know them." It is very easy to jeer at that word and to dismiss it as maudlin sentiment or a pathetic example of senile blindness. It was neither. I have known few men freer from both qualities. It was a lovely and honest expression of a quality without which we are poor indeed. "Pride in possessions" is perhaps one way of expressing it; but it is far more than that. Centuries before him, Cicero had said essentially the same thing: "What is there in nature so dear to man as his own children?" And with equal point he might have said "his country." It is easy to raise the flag of warning here: Such an attitude, we are told, is responsible for most of the woes of life. Frankly, I doubt it. Because I am fonder of my wife, my children, my country, than I am of other men's wives, children, or countries does not mean that I dislike the others or even consider them inferior. How we love to make those artificial contrasts. To confess that the toast of Stephen Decatur is still congenial, quite despite the tirades it has provoked, is to make one truly suspect. Nonetheless I cheerfully make the confession, quite regardless of the many beautiful months which I have spent in other lands in the past and hope to relive when this silly world once again loses its fever. And the man who tries to strut his broad-mindedness with the word, "I have no more love for America than for any other land," like the man who says, "I am as fond of every woman as I am of my own wife," never gets an invitation to my house.

And the same with religion. For me it would be quite impossible to be a Catholic, a Jew, a Mohammedan, or a Buddhist. But that in no wise implies that I look down on them as inferior or burn to make those who find profound values in them as I. It is when we start to parade our values as the absolutes, to decry our neighbors' and friends' as inferior, that we open Pandora's dread box.

But how natural it is. How sure we Christians are that the genius of Christianity is love, a virtue quite unknown to all those who do not worship at the foot of the Mount of Beatitudes. Righteousness for Judaism; love for Christianity. How we love to draw that contrast. And naturally many modern Jews have risen to the challenge, have tried to anticipate their critics: "We admit the contrast and glory in it. Righteousness is superior to love." We love to point to the negative emphasis in the decalogue: Eight of the Ten Commandments start with "Thou shalt not." Of course, the Golden Rule in its positive form is

"immeasurably superior" to the negative form as found in Tobit and in Hillel's famous word. So it goes. How hard it is to realize that apologetics and polemics are not the sole fundamentals of the heavenly music. And of course the pious Jew is sure that the negative form is precisely the same, if not actually better, than the positive form. And thus we all continue quite deaf to the occasional suggestion that the difference between positive and negative here is quite accidental and that in both forms we have in essence "only the morality of naïve egotism."

These musings were prompted by the casual word of a highly competent and dispassionate scholar which I chanced upon last night as I was rereading the magnificent little writing which we so casually describe as "one of the minor prophets": Habakkuk. What a book that is! Who the prophet was we do not know. In fact, should we call him a "prophet"? He has no neat and mouth-filling message to his wicked countrymen. God has not whispered (or shouted) in his ear what will befall the wicked if they do not forthrightly repent. In short, he is not talking for God to the nation at all—as a proper prophet should. Instead, he is troubled, sorely troubled, by the obvious inequalities of life and the rank injustice all about. Not for him the smugness of the Psalmist: "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, or his seed begging bread." He sees precisely that on every hand. He speaks. But it is not *for* God; it is *to* God. How can God permit such injustice? The tyrant has outraged not only Israel but all mankind as well. And God does nothing about it. The tyrant is taking men as the fish of the sea, constantly filling his nets as though no God existed. Outraged at this injustice, Habakkuk boldly faces the Almighty.

But to his doubts and perplexity there is an answer, and it is from within. He will not sulk in his tent like Achilles by the plains of windy Troy. He has a post to keep. He will not fail. Rather he must be loyal to the royal within. He will stand on his watchtower and see what God will do. With Koheleth he could have said: "Fear God, and keep his commandments." Instead, he reveals his own unconquerable courage, and even more magnificently. Despite all the apparent and so evident facts of life, there can be but one answer: "The righteous man shall live by his faithfulness." Or better said, "he who is enduring-in-his-confidence-and-faithfulness shall live."

There have been few grander utterances since man's advent on this planet. What iron that puts in our blood! Righteousness, justice, staunchness, loyalty, trustworthiness, fidelity, integrity, faithfulness: these have the elements of permanency and will last forever. Along with Job he takes his stand on a rock which will outlast every storm.

So I pondered as I thrilled again last night at the word of that mighty

man of old—his head might be bloody, but it was unbowed. And then came the word that sent my mind wandering. I read: "In the New Testament (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11; Hebr. 10:38) and as the motto of Martin Luther, these famous words acquired a much deeper meaning than they had originally." And I found myself querying: Did they? Was it "deeper"? Different, yes; and one that has left an indelible stain—and for good—in subsequent thinking. But was it "deeper," more fundamental, more basic? Can we not see values without always raising the either/or, or insisting, "This is better"? Must all insight, all values, come from the same source to be really excellent?

"The just shall live by faith." What folly to deny that that insight of Paul's was another of life's momentous discoveries. But, as James was later to insist, it lay wide open to abuse and misunderstanding, and through the years has tended to turn our attention from the tonic word of the ancient skeptic. For through the years "faith" and "faithfulness" have come to be very different things. I am not so sure they were for Paul. The more I live with him, the more convinced I am that for him the word "faith" (*pistis*) was a deal more like the Hebrew *'emunah* ("faithfulness," "steadfastness") than we have realized. For it was not credulity without or despite evidence, as it so often has become. For Paul it meant the quality or temper which was synonymous with "in Christ"; in a word, it meant "new life." But there were differences, and it is idle to dismiss them. In this editorial there is no place for a detailed discussion of what the word meant for Paul, or the place that his paraphrase has had as the expression of the genius of evangelical Christianity. My one concern is that the earlier word be not forced into the later mold, as so frequently has been the case at the hands of translators influenced by Christian diction. Quite regardless of what the phrase meant to Paul; quite regardless of what it has meant, when viewed through the Pauline or Lutheran spectacles, to Christendom, to Habukkuk it is devoid of doctrinal significance—good, bad, or indifferent. It is not theology; it is ethics, and mighty good ethics, too.

# From Off the Campus and On

ONCE AGAIN Professor Reid rings the bell. A previous article, "The Layman Observes the Minister" (July, 1942), had to be reprinted to meet the demand. It is almost certain that many will feel that the present essay, "The Humanities and the Curricula," is of equal moment. If colleges do not consider it their prime function to enable men and women to meet life with rich and trained minds which cannot be stampeded, it were better for them to style themselves trade schools and quit prattling about liberal education. None is more competent to discuss this theme than is Dr. Reid. A graduate of Wake Forest and of Cornell, he has been head of the department of philosophy in the former since 1923.

Mr. Westphal has been minister of the Lansdowne (Pennsylvania) Baptist Church since 1923. He is a graduate of Cornell and of Colgate-Rochester and holds the degree of master of theology from Crozer. For several years he has been a member of the faculty of the Baptist Institute in Philadelphia. Frequent reviews from him have appeared in our pages.

Dr. Kramer is a newcomer to readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY, and a very welcome once. He is an eminent Assyriologist and an international authority in the field of his particular specialty, Sumerology. He has been a fellow of the American Council of Learned Societies, a Guggenheim fellow, and a member of several expeditions to the Near East. For ten years he was on the staff of the Oriental Institute; he is now associate curator of the University Museum in Philadelphia. His latest volume, *Sumerian Literary Texts from Nippur,* will be reviewed in these pages in a subsequent issue.

Dr. Goodenough is professor of the history of religion in Yale University. He holds a doctorate in philosophy from Oxford, was for three years a graduate student at Harvard, and has received sundry other degrees, in course and *honoris causa.* For ten years he was editor of the *Journal of Biblical Literature.* His numerous books include *By Light, Light, Religious Tradition and Myth,* and *An Introduction to Philo Judæus.* By training and temperament he is admirably fitted to discuss the theme, "The Mystical Value of Scholarship."

After several years on the faculty of the Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, Dr. Haupert recently became its president. He is an Old Testament scholar of distinction, is a member of many learned societies, and during the past academic year was president of the Philadelphia Oriental Club. His paper on exploration in Palestine and Transjordania was his presidential address in that society.

Mr. Crocker was born in Wales, but received his college and professional training in the United States. He is a graduate of Denison and Crozer and holds a master's degree in church music and liturgics from Oberlin. He volunteered as an Army chaplain on the day after Pearl

Harbor and served both at home and abroad. He was promoted to the rank of captain while in the Southwest Pacific. He was injured while on transport duty and after hospitalization was recently retired to civilian life. He is now manager of a servicemen's centre in Washington. His brief article is timely and lays the emphasis where it ought to be laid: Let the pastor be a pastor.

Professor Braden has been a member of the faculty of Northwestern University since 1926, and is now professor of history and literature of religions. He is a graduate of Union Theological Seminary and of the University of Chicago, with a Ph.D. from the latter. Following his ordination to the Methodist ministry in 1912, he served as a missionary in Bolivia and Chile. He is the author of several books, among which are *World Religions, Man's Quest for Salvation,* and *Varieties of American Religion.*

Letters from our readers continue to comment favorably on our book reviews and notices. Apparently our readers appreciate the fact that the policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to appraise books fairly, not to sell them. To the twenty-one reviewers in this issue we extend cordial thanks. Professor Abrams is a member of the department of sociology at Pennsylvania. Dr. Austin is minister of the Tioga Baptist Church, Philadelphia, and a Ph.D. from the University. Dr. Beiler is professor of English Bible and philosophy of religion at Allegheny College. Professor Casteel holds the chair of public speech at Union Theological Seminary. Professor Donovan was for many years head of the department of Old Testament at Andover Newton. Dr. Enslin is professor of New Testament at Crozer. Professor Ferm is head of the department of philosophy at Wooster College. Professor Fries is a member of the department of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. Dr. Groves, for many years at Boston University, is professor of social science at the University of North Carolina. Professor Harkness is head of the department of church history at Crozer. Dr. Haupert has been introduced in an earlier paragraph. Professor Hightower has the chair of sociology at Kalamazoo. Mr. Keighton is professor of homiletics at Crozer. Dr. Kramer needs no further word of introduction. Professor Lyman was until his retirement professor of theology at Union. Dr. Minear is assistant professor of New Testament at Andover Newton. Professor Montgomery was for many years head of the department of Semitics at Pennsylvania. Professor Pritchard holds the chair of Old Testament at Crozer. Dr. Richards is a member of the department of zoology at Pennslyvania. Dr. Robbins, a former president of the Northern Baptist Convention, was for many years a foreign secretary of the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society. Professor Tuck is a member of the department of New Testament at Andover Newton.

# BOOK REVIEWS

*Earth Might Be Fair,* by Richard S. Emrich, New York, Harper, 1945, pp. x, 112, $1.50.

This is the Presiding Bishop's Book for Lent, by the professor of Christian ethics at the Episcopal Theological School. It is an aid to searching self-examination and to the establishment, as its title implies, of a Christian social hope.

At the outset the author takes up the "great question," proposed by the Psalmist, "What is man?" and he emphasizes the need that man recognize his creaturely littleness before God. This recognition is needed especially because of the tendency of modern man to think of himself as self-sufficient and to put himself in the place of God. At the same time, "there is no worse cancer of the spirit than a cheap estimate of human nature and its goal" (p. 13). Man needs to realize the complexity of his nature, the mystery of his powers of thought and of freedom, the truth of the Christian teaching that he is a child of God. The deepest tragedy of our day is that "we have as a people played fast and loose with the spiritual tradition which has been the major factor in the formation of our liberties and our cherished institutions" (p. 17).

In contrast to all secularism and humanism "the greatness and dignity of man" must be based on a living relation to God and a recognition of man's eternal destiny. Such is the true source of our human responsibility and human equality. At the same time, "The Christian should . . . co-operate wholeheartedly with the many good causes begun and carried on by 'nonbelievers,' many of whom with their passionate concern for justice put churchmen to shame" (p. 31). But the "tired liberal" and the disillusioned follower of the "social gospel" are a warning to us that, "if we are to remain steadfast, our endeavors cannot be built upon anything less than the eternal will of God" (p. 39).

In the chapter, "We Have Erred and Strayed," the author emphasizes that the essence of sin is man's pride and self-centredness, and shows how man's universal sinfulness lies at the root of all the evils of the world. But modern man has developed a self-complacency and maintained an easy conscience, by attributing these evils solely to external conditions. This refusal to face our common sin adds "to the savagery of history by making the struggles of our time into 'righteous' wars between the 'good' and the 'bad.'" It deprives us of spiritual renewal, which comes only through penitence. And it results in repeated disillusionment, if we place our final reliance "in science or education, the classless society or any hierarchy of organization," instead of in God's saving work through Christ (pp. 48-52).

Self-centredness, the author points out, appears not only in overconcern for one's individual self, but also in giving supreme place to "extensions of the ego"—such as, *my* family, *my* race, *my* nation. These groups have their intrinsic value, and loyalty to them is important and rightful, but they must be kept subordinate to the sovereign Lordship of God. Otherwise the worship of these extensions of the self results in lovelessness outside these groups and "the inability to reconcile man to man" (p. 70).

The most valuable chapter in the book, in the opinion of the present reviewer, is the one entitled "Man and Fellowship." "Man," says the author, "is made for fellowship with God and Man. It is the most precious thing on earth—the great inner meaning of the family, the school, the nation, the Church" (p. 72).

This significance of fellowship as the crown of life springs from man's social nature. Man's deepest desire is for community. To the end of our lives we are dependent upon others. And before we are self-conscious personalities we are members of a group. Our economic individualism has done violence to this social nature of man and has furnished a provocation for fascism and communism. It has brought about insecurity for millions in our modern world. "Let us never forget that when we deny men work, we deny them any real part in the community" (p. 77).

At the same time, modern mass movements have tended to deny the true value of the individual. In Christian teaching the right relation between the individual and society is preserved because the supreme loyalty is to be given to God. To love God is to be responsible for bringing to pass a community in which men live as members one of another. "It was the fact of this community with its universalism, its love, which caught the heart of the ancient world"; and it is for Christians, through a great missionary endeavor, to establish that fact with new power in the modern world (pp. 80, 81).

"True fellowship is broken within the nation by individualism and class loyalty." And it is broken on a vast scale by nationalism,—whether in the form of isolationism or imperialism. The need for a world government should be patent to every Christian. Again fellowship is gravely endangered by the interpretation of man and his history in terms of race. "A Christian can have nothing to do with this racial interpretation of man—except to oppose it; for it denies the universalism of the Gospel" (pp. 84, 87). As a world we have lost the truth about God and man. And to a certain degree the church itself has been infected with these evils. "One of our chief tasks today is to see that the Church is truly the Church, to hold before the world a fellowship that transcends the differences between man and man, to clean house, so that obviously, with no chance of misinterpretation, the Church will stand opposed to the racial and national heresies of our time" (pp. 92, 93).

In his final chapter, "The New Creature," Dr. Emrich urges the necessity of conversion—at the same time safeguarding his position by explaining that he means by conversion "a personal turning to God which involves membership in the Christian Church." We also must avoid stereotyping conversion by insisting on certain emotional experiences; rather we must test its reality "by the fruit which it bears in the joy, peace, love, courage, that come to our lives" (pp. 94, 95). "Christianity is a religion of Grace. It always begins with God's gracious approach to our lives. It is God's Love, His Holy Spirit, working on the human heart" (p. 111).

This book is written with fervor and is rich in spiritual suggestiveness. It furnishes valuable material for study, whether by individuals or groups.

EUGENE W. LYMAN

*The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible*, revised by Henry Snyder Gehman, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1944, pp. xii, 658, and 16 maps, $3.50.

The assignment of this dictionary for review has been an interesting lesson in textual criticism. In 1898 there appeared *A Dictionary of the Bible* by John D. Davis; revised editions were issued in 1903, 1911, 1924. Now a fifth edition of this work has been published under a slightly different title, revised and rewritten by Professor Henry S. Gehman of Princeton Theological Seminary. It is not the task of this reviewer to pass judgment upon the work of Professor Davis—yet he cannot let go unchallenged the statement upon the jacket which speaks of the "universally

accepted 'Davis' Bible Dictionary' "—rather it is to evaluate the work of the reviser in the light of modern knowledge and of the need to which the work is addressed.

The present edition is intended for pastors, for workers in churches, and for teachers of the Bible. Economy of space has ruled out any bibliography. The omission of the names of scholars whose opinions are mentioned is unfortunate. Too frequently one's curiosity is met by a meaningless generalization as "critics," "critics generally," "best authorities." For those who are not particularly interested in critical questions this dictionary fills a real need. It is a ready concordance of persons, of place names, of objects of daily life mentioned in the Bible. There are no Hebrew or Greek characters; yet careful attention is paid to etymologies. Pronunciations are given according to current usage. Not the least valuable feature of the book is a series of sixteen maps in color by G. E. Wright and Floyd V. Filson, with an index to the places given on the maps.

Professor Gehman has contributed a wealth of new material to the book. The archæological evidence with regard to the conquest of Canaan, a fair presentation of the material sometimes offered as evidence for a general flood, an article on Ras Shamra, an excellent table of alphabets, an article on the Hittites—all this and much more is distinctly new and fresh in the text. The author has been particularly diligent with regards to the meanings of names. Not only Hebrew and Greek words are given, but Arabic, Akkadian, Neo-Babylonian, Aramaic words and meanings are given. One learns that the derivation of an English slang word, "shickered," meaning "drunken," is from a well-known Hebrew root. Professor Gehman has included such things as the recently recognized meaning of *hammanim* (p. 584).

It is surprising to find the article on Ezekiel reprinted, almost unchanged, from the edition of twenty years ago. Nothing is said of the work of Hölscher (1924), of Herntrich (1932), G. A. Cooke (1937), Matthews (1939), nor of Professor Gehman's own contribution to Ezekiel studies with the study of the John H. Scheide papyri (*JBL*, LVII, pp. 281-287). The present edition retains the verdict of Davis: "Critics of the school of Wellhausen regard Ezekiel as the father of the later formal Judaism. . . . This theory is rejected by scholars who take the Biblical view of the origin of Israel's institutions . . ." (p. 178).

Gehman has allowed the article on Ecclesiastes to remain substantially as it appeared in 1924. No mention is made of the glosses in the book. It is asserted that "the book may be regarded either as a writing of Solomon himself in his old age or as words which, though not actually uttered by Solomon, accurately sum up his completed experience . . ." (p. 145). The article on Proverbs stands essentially as it was in 1898. This held that the titles attributing about two-thirds of the book to Solomon "may safely be regarded as authentic." No mention is made of the Egyptian book, *The Wisdom of Amen-em-ope,* from which one of the editors of Proverbs obviously drew. The article on Ruth seems to be taken directly from the edition of 1898. There Davis held that "the narrative is, accordingly, historical" (p. 521). The article on Genesis is repeated almost to the letter from the edition of forty-six years ago and gives but a summary of the contents of the book.

Some articles have been revised considerably in order to bring them into line with the more modern critical views. Davis, in 1924, wrote concerning the Song of Songs that "the probabilities unquestionably favor the belief that the title attributes the poem to Solomon. The mind of the author as revealed in the Song admirably comports with all that is known of Solomon." Gehman has discarded the Solomonic authorship as no longer tenable even by conservative scholars, but he has not discarded

the usefulness of the book, in that "its place in the canon has approved itself to those souls who have known how to use it in an allegorical and mystical sense" (p.574).

In dealing with the books of Samuel Davis devoted a number of columns to a detailed criticism of Wellhausen and the "divisive critics" and concluded that "there is no ground, therefore, for the assumption that contradictory documents have been combined to form the First Book of Samuel." Gehman omits all the refutation with the remark that critics generally have come to the conclusion that the books of Samuel comprise at least two principal sources (p. 532). This is a decided improvement over the former edition. Davis held to the unity of authorship for Zechariah. Gehman has rightly held that "critics generally" hold the view that chapters 9 to 14 are not the work of Zechariah.

The article on Job is an improvement over that in earlier editions of the work. Gehman admits that a majority of scholars question the Elihu speeches as a later addition to the poem—Davis seems to have considered the book as a unity—but he repeats the statement that "a number of first-class critics maintain that the Elihu speeches are original" (p. 315). The difficulty of the differences between the points of view in the prose and in the poetical sections is not mentioned.

Davis in 1924 closed his article on Isaiah with a vehement protest against the theory of dual authorship. To the objections of the mention of Cyrus in the alleged Deutero-Isaiah he asserted: "If predictive prophecy is possible, if it was ever uttered by holy men taught by the Holy Spirit, then the name of Cyrus could have been penned by Isaiah. . . . The church has always believed in predictive prophecy and in the inspiration of Isaiah." Thus Davis ended the article on Isaiah. Gehman contributes three additional columns giving the arguments for a Deutero-Isaiah and a Trito-Isaiah. He concludes that "the interpretation is simplified and seems more reasonable if a later authorship for these chapters [40-66] is accepted. . . . It should also be borne in mind that Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah may have been divinely inspired just as much as Isaiah." Gehman is extremely careful to deal gently with those of his readers who may not have been exposed to any higher criticism.

The position of Davis with regard to the Pentateuch was clear. "The Pentateuch testifies expressly to the Mosaic authorship of its contents." For him the criticism which distributes the narrative among different writers is "demonstrably invalid." These views Gehman modifies to a great extent. He recognizes the tendency toward acceptance of the documentary hypothesis but takes comfort in the fact that "the present trend in O. T. studies is away from the earlier and rather hypothetical criticism" (p. 469) and that "archæological, philological, and historical studies support the verisimilitude of the Pentateuch" (p. 470).

Those who are conversant with the debates in biblical criticism will easily recognize in the revision a position which is somewhat to the right of centre. The work is clearly labeled as an attempt to maintain a tradition of sound and conservative scholarship. It is no mean task to attempt to revise the work of another, particularly when many of the views cherished by the predecessor have long since ceased to be shared by contemporary scholars. In every respect the present edition is an improvement over the earlier work.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

*Babel's Tower,* by Francis Henry Taylor, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 53, $1.

In the past seventy-five years, the American museum has grown and developed at a truly phenomenal pace. The number of individual institutions has risen from a few hundred to over two thousand. The capital investment in museum buildings has

increased from half a million dollars to three hundred times that figure. Their operating income has grown from several thousand dollars annually to almost twenty millions, while the museum collections through purchase, gift, and bequest are beyond any price. Museum activities have expanded to include all kinds of scientific explorations and archæological expeditions. Through its exhibitions which currently attract some fifty million visitors a year, and through lecture work and class instruction, the museum has become a vital factor in the educational life of the community. The number of museum personnel of one type or another now runs into the thousands.

The intellectual and spiritual drive behind this remarkable museum expansion in the relatively recent past had a twofold aspect: it consisted primarily of an unwavering faith in the intrinsic value of knowledge, and of a profound reverence for man's past achievements. But rightly or wrongly, for better or worse, the validity of both these postulates is now being seriously questioned. Knowledge, it is now generally argued, is without significance unless it is pertinent and relevant to the immediate scene. And as for the "wisdom of the past," its glory is fading fast. The dawning era, with its well-nigh incredible scientific advances and transforming techniques, seems to have little to learn and less to take from the slow-moving yesteryears; it is the future rather than the past that bulks large as an immediate creative factor. With this pronounced shift in our ideological climate, it is obvious that the museum had better look to its props. It seems to be high time for its leaders and mentors to reëxamine its aims and purposes, and where necessary, to reorient the direction of its activities.

It is just such a timely restatement of the museum's place in our democracy which Francis Henry Taylor, the director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, undertakes in his *Babel's Tower*. It is a little book, a very little book. But by the time the reader has turned the last of the fifty-three pages, he will have learned much of what is significant about museums; particularly, of course, about art museums. At the same time he will no doubt have been strongly moved by the author's passionate convictions. For Taylor, whose method and approach is broadly humanistic throughout, wields a bold brush and paints a wide stroke; there is comparatively little of line and detail. By a skillful and dexterous arrangement of his material, he puts the reader through his affective paces. With the author, the reader will wax angry at the pundits, charlatans, and "High Priests" of the "Culture" cult; his heart will turn heavy at the museum's past failures and current dilemmas; it will rebound with rosy hope at the coming democratic promise.

The very first essay in the booklet sets its tone and tenor; it introduces the theme on the grand scale. Captioned "Babel's Tower," the name given to the book as a whole, it is devoted primarily to a rather poignant sketch of the imaginative sweep of Paul Otelet's and Le Corbusier's abortive project, the Mundaneum, or World Museum. The plan never went further than the drawing board, for the recent world blackout has made a mockery of this vision of the universal museum, and indeed of culture and civilization as a whole. With this unrealized ideal as a backdrop, the author turns to a brief sketch of the museum's rôle throughout the ages, from the time of the Great Museum of Alexandria to the French Revolution, when the idea of the museum as a public institution first arose. Follows an essay on "the American phenomenon," which begins with the history of the American museum as a child of nineteenth-century liberal thought, and ends with an invective against art for the arty. The matter is further pursued with a discussion of the potential rôle of the museum in American cultural and intellectual life, which leads to the conclusion that "the emphasis of our generation must be expositive and explanatory," rather than

on the continued frenzied acquisition and collection, a pertinent summation in which all who have eyes to see and ears to hear will readily concur. The book concludes with its longest essay devoted to the problem of the museum in relation to our democratic future, in which the museum is called upon "to fulfill a social function," "to deal straightforwardly in human values," "to be the midwife of democracy."

Even from this brief sketch of its contents, it will be obvious that the book is timely, significant, and highly stimulating. It analyzes penetratingly the numerous museum problems and illuminates them with a broad insight. There is little doubt that the majority of its ideas and suggestions will receive the universal approval of the more forward-looking cultural leaders of our day. The book is destined to exert very considerable influence on American humanistic thought and practice. All the more reason, therefore, to turn the searchlight on one aspect of our intellectual complex to which it contributes little that is either profound or constructive.

In the matter of the scholar and his place in the community and in the museum, the judgments and pronouncements scattered throughout the book are by no means as justified as the necessarily streamlined and oversimplified summations imply. After reading the booklet one would tend to conclude that the scholar is generally a socially irresponsible creature who purposely tries to make himself unintelligible to the public for whom he has nothing but contempt. Thus, to quote only a few of the relevant passages, it says that "the scholar with his insistence upon minutiæ has created a forest in which it is impossible to see the woods for the trees," or that "more and more the specialist has withdrawn into a world of his own, writing learned and pseudo-scientific dissertations addressed to a few colleagues," or that the archæologists and art historians "have reduced the study of previous cultures to exhaustive classifications of empty vessels." But these harsh constructions are all far too one-sided; they fail to take into consideration the complex dynamics of scholarship as it adds bit by bit to human knowledge and understanding.

Unjust as it may seem, one of the inherent characteristics of the process of creative and productive scholarship is the phenomenon that the great majority of its workers remain largely anonymous while the synthesizers who command the public eye are few and far between. For obviously enough, in spite of those rare and lucky Master Minds who prefer to do their work quite unhampered by facts, significant synthesis must rely on what, it is hoped, will prove to be a wise selection from huge masses of accurate and trustworthy data. Now unfortunately these data, unlike the children of Hamelin, are not charmed forth by the very first sounds of the piper's tune. It takes endless time, unlimited patience, devoted care, and profound inner conviction of their ultimate value, to ferret them out from their more or less hidden lairs, and to assemble, order, and integrate them into usable form. But it is to be realized that at this level they are only very rarely of interest to the public at large. The public first meets them through the eyes of the synthesizer who sifts, evaluates, eliminates, and finally molds and organizes some of what seems to him to be the more pertinent material, into a unified structure. But even the synthesizer's drastically reduced presentation with its broader appeal will reach only a thin layer of readers and students. For the wider masses, a third level of synthesis and exposition usually becomes a practical necessity.

Now it should be fairly obvious that it is only in quite extraordinary cases that the same scholar can work productively and effectively on all three levels. By and large, it is the relatively nameless drudge who labors consistently and persistently in the first, the data-gathering, level. With "sweat, blood, and tears"—and these words are not being used here in their figurative sense alone—he lays the foundations

on which his more fortunate, and only at times, more gifted confrere, the synthesizer, builds his edifice to the plaudits and, now and then, even the shekels of the public at large. It is this more or less anonymous toiler in the field of scholarship who is the "unknown soldier" in the uphill struggle for human knowledge and understanding; his grave is not unhallowed. No doubt the scholarly world has its share of dilettantes, charlatans, fossils, stuffed shirts, and frustrated, maladjusted introverts. But by and large it is hardly likely that their number is appreciably and proportionately larger than that of their counterparts in any of the other professions. Indeed, to counterbalance the rather sorry impression of the scholar which emerges from the pages of *Babel's Tower,* the reader might do well to turn to the words of Alfred North Whitehead, himself no smalltimer at weaving pertinent syntheses, who writes in his *Adventures of Ideas* as follows: "For the facts in detail we shall be dependent upon that great band of critical scholars whose labors to-day and for the past three centuries lay upon mankind an obligation of deepest reverence."

As for the scholar in the museum, there is every indication that his services, if intelligently canalized and utilized, can become a vital factor in practically all the museum's assorted activities. Especially is this true of the larger museums who devote considerable space and time to the history of civilization. For to be truly effective, these institutions must have at their disposal the very latest and most reliable data, the best expert and technical help for the objects and their display, and broad and well-planned educational facilities. But departmentalize their subjects as they will, it is hardly likely that these museums can expect to find a single individual sufficiently gifted to perform all these duties adequately. Even the hope of training so rare and blessed a bird, a combination scholar-showman-technician-educator, seems rather illusory. A more likely solution would seem to call for all-around intelligent coöperation, with an alert and imaginative administrative personnel directing, coordinating, and fusing the individual efforts of the various specialists, the scholar included.

SAMUEL NOAH KRAMER

*Naturalism and the Human Spirit,* edited by Yervant H. Krikorian, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. x, 397, $4.50.

It is high time that a coöperative manifesto on behalf of naturalistic philosophy makes its appearance. Naturalism is a viewpoint which has definitely arrived, and no one can afford to ignore it if he would know what is going on in the contemporary philosophical world. There are here fifteen essays on topics ranging from historical backgrounds, back to the Greeks and early Americans, to a discussion of specific topics such as ontology, epistemology, psychology, religion, and ethics. Professor Morris R. Cohen's name appear on the dedicatory page.

I do not believe I have ever read anything by John Dewey which shows as much animation and emotional concern as does the opening chapter written by him. He is plainly angry. And he has cause. One by one the arguments of supernaturalists against naturalists are taken up by him and disposed. He shows how unfair they have been, heaping on the term *naturalism* their own peculiar antipathies. Not all devils are found in my camp, Dewey seems to say. All the sins of men can be duplicated on the side of the supernaturalists. We are not materialists, and you know better than to call us such. Our modern philosophies are not peculiarly responsible for the present world débâcle; there have been débâcles even when men accepted supernaturalism in all good faith. We are not hard-boiled mechanists. We do not like your pious charges. Your conferences on science, philosophy, and religion are turned to your own prejudices. You really do not seem to know what

is implied by a genuinely scientific spirit. Nontheological supernaturalists are still under the spell of Christian traditionalism. Maritain damns all but the saintly supernaturalists under the guise of a liberal Catholicism. But Maritain still belongs among the ancients. Our modern technological advance has come by way of a naturalistic approach; and we shall have progress if we but apply that same approach to questions of social relationships. We shall never get it on any other terms. God helps him who helps himself. So far Dewey.

Professor Lamprecht offers this definition of naturalism: "a philosophical position, empirical in method, that regards everything that exists or occurs to be conditioned in its existence or occurrence by causal factors within one all-encompassing system of nature, however 'spiritual' or purposeful or rational some of these things and events may in their functions and values prove to be." "Empirical" means for him the emphasis upon experienceable facts rather than upon some favorable idea no matter how emotionally appealing. For Lamprecht the traditional arguments for God are not sufficiently empirical. This means, he seems to say, that we can get along without any conventional type of theology. Theology is not to be taken etymologically but as the name for disciplined thinking about real religious values and ideals. The religious life, he says, consists in the achievement of an organic unity of interests around some central ideal or core. The religious person should not get too enthusiastic; his religion should be an adornment rather than the kind of commitment which keeps his mind closed to new insights.

Professor Sidney Hook argues for democracy as not needing the undergirding of any metaphysical theology. He joins Dewey in attacking supernaturalistic arguments. The ethical and good life has feet of its own on which to stand without waiting for ultimate pronouncements. Abraham Edel argues for choice as the basic ethical category in an enlightening essay dealing with ethical theories. John Herman Randall sums up the essays and rightly points out that the naturalism here represented is thoroughly American (he might have added, with special emphasis upon the influences of New York), with the trinity of gods, Dewey, Santayana, and Woodbridge as leaders and M. R. Cohen a runner-up.

There are other essays, equally meaty, dealing with the categories of naturalism, on Woodbridge, early American naturalism, æsthetics, logic, history of philosophy, and a fine-combed distinction between the natural and the unnatural advocated by Professor Schneider. This reviewer's only criticisms of the book run along these lines: It seems too confined to the Eastern seaboard; there is a strong movement in the Middle West which the editor seems not to have cast his eye upon. I refer to the naturalism long emanating from Chicago. Again, the conclusions seem too negative to this reviewer. One may, for example, be a naturalist and still have a respectable theology of real metaphysical import. Metaphysics, in other words, is not synonymous with supernaturalism.

VERGILIUS FERM

*A Panorama of Prejudice,* by Harry Cohen, New York, Bloch, 1944, pp. 150, (price not given).

"What is the reason for all this hatred [of the Jew]?" asks Mr. Cohen. He then proceeds to unfold the answers.

The reader is informed that the Jews are really a wonderful and magnificent people: they have made many remarkable contributions to civilization, are law abiding, and an asset to any country. "Since the time of the Ten Commandments nearly thirty-two hundred years ago, the Jews have given to Democracy much of

its true meaning." "It is precisely because they are a factor for good, not evil, in the life of every worthwhile democracy that they meet with so many tribulations at the hands of the reactionaries."

The Jews, apparently, are not really appreciated by the gentiles. In fact, the gentiles are envious, jealous of their abilities, the way they get ahead in the world, and feel inferior to the Jews. Hence the hatred.

Mr. Cohen furnishes a long list of the persecutions which the Jewish people have undergone. That these manifestations of hatred have been cruel and unchristian, few people will deny. He analyzes the report that "The Jews killed Christ" and shows, to the shame of Christians, the damage that has been done in perpetuating this lie.

The statement is made that none of the civilizations of the past that persecuted Jews has survived. Witness Egypt, Babylon, Rome. Spain has been decadent since the Jewish expulsion in 1492. Preczarist Russia is no more. In the light of history, therefore, any culture that persecutes the Israelites inevitably will die. If the United States wishes to survive, we must cease our discrimination against these innocent people. It all boils down to the fact that "anti-Semitism is not a Jewish but a Gentile problem."

The remedy: "the permanent development of a Jewish homeland in Palestine," "the education and intellectual development of Jews wherever thy may be found, as well as a similar development amongst Christians," and "a drastic revision of the crucifixion story, in line with the true historical facts. . . ."

While the author is earnest and sincere, the book indicates a lack of training in the handling of historical and socio-psychological materials. Space does not permit the tabulation of perhaps a hundred illustrations of this. But consider the statement about the Jewish contribution to democracy. Any impartial student of the Old and New Testaments realizes the naïveté of that assumption. The author quotes the British Israel Society to the effect that "the lost ten tribes of Israel are really the Americans and the British." Where is the anthropologist or historian of standing who would agree with that declaration? Etcetera.

Anti-Semitism is, of course, a part of a much larger picture. The frame of reference is the conflict of cultures. Consider the rôle that conspicuous minorities have nearly always played in the intercultural conflict through the centuries. Then there is the fear of the stranger and all the psychological implications of that fact. Deep down are the unconscious feelings of fear, anxiety, the frustrations that lead people to seek an outlet. These lead to aggression. The minorities that can be identified and which seem to be different and which are thought in some way to constitute a threat—they become the scapegoats. While one has every sympathy for the minorities, is it not a fact that the Jews themselves have contributed no little to their own persecution by the continuation of the assumption that they are "the chosen people," and by the constant emphasis on doctrines of particularism which belong to an age long since departed? In other words, to place all the blame on the gentiles, as Mr. Cohen does, is to miss the whole point of the problem of acculturation.

No amount of moralizing is going to change the habit patterns of our society with reference to anti-Semitism. Until we know more about the interplay of the social and economic forces with human emotions, we shall not find the answer to one of the most distressing problems of mankind. Basically we need more exploration and knowledge in the world of the formation of attitudes and conditioned responses to symbols. That also takes us into the field of mental hygiene and social control.

And in the days to come psychoanalysis will have a considerable body of data that will enable us to see the deeper underlying factors in the individual that makes for group conflict.

RAY H. ABRAMS

*The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible,* by George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson, Philadelphia, Westminster, 1945, pp. 114 (illustrated), $3.50.

With an up-to-date historical atlas of the Bible long overdue, a volume of the high quality of the *Westminster Historical Atlas* is likely to receive an enthusiastic welcome from biblical students and scholars of many varieties.

Second in a series known as the *Westminster Aids to the Study of the Scriptures,* the *Historical Atlas* is the product of the joint authorship of Professors G. Ernest Wright and Floyd V. Filson, of McCormick Theological Seminary. Professors William F. Albright, Millar Burrows, and Ovid R. Sellers served as an advisory committee for the project. Professor Albright also contributed an introductory article entitled "The Rediscovery of the Biblical World."

The body of the work consists of a series of thirty-three maps in full color, produced, according to the publishers' explanation, by a special process from "hand-drawn maps photographically reproduced by half-tone engravings." The cartographers were Hal and Jean Arbo and Professor Georges Barrois. The maps are distinctly and unusually attractive. All include an effective portrayal of the physical features of the biblical world.

The thirty-three maps are accompanied by a series of historical sketches which furnish a comprehensive survey of the entire history of the biblical world from the time of the patriarchs to the expansion of Christianity as far as the time of Constantine. The authors have drawn freely upon all available information. The most recent results of archæological discoveries, philological studies, and historical criticism are consistently kept in the foreground.

Besides the maps and their accompanying sketches, readers will be impressed by the photographs which appear throughout the volume. Particularly noteworthy is the panorama of Jerusalem made from an artist's drawing of 1938. Of great value also is the Chronological Outline of Ancient History.

Proofreading slips are rare. On p. 65, for example, A.D. 700 should be A.D. 100. This reviewer is of the opinion that the volume would profit by a complete bibliography, by a map of modern Palestine more complete than the map which includes excavated sites, and by notations on one of the Jerusalem maps showing elevation above sea level at a dozen or so points in and about Jerusalem.

Quite apart from the above comments, however, the *Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible* is a work which merits positive commendation for the high quality of its scholarship and for its many attractive features. Professors Wright and Filson, along with their associates and the Westminster Press, have rendered an outstanding service to biblical studies.

RAYMOND S. HAUPERT

*Meet Amos and Hosea,* by Rolland Emerson Wolfe, New York, Harper, ©1945, pp. xxx, 180, $2.

The title is accurate: this book is an introduction to Amos and Hosea. It is not a commentary with learned references. Not a single footnote (except biblical references) appears in the half devoted to Amos; in the section on Hosea but four brief references make a bid to divert the reader's attention from the body of the text. This is not the only way in which the author has shown admirable restraint. Frequently

he must have found himself at a point where modern parallels to ancient situations could be drawn. That pleasure he has left to the reader. It is not a book of sermons, nor of hints for sermons. To what genre of biblical studies does this book belong? It is a popular presentation of the results of "higher criticism" of these two prophets of Israel. Higher criticism is often unreadable because of its absorption with glosses, redactors, editors, and a plethora of technical terms, the cliché of higher criticism. This, one does not find in Professor Wolfe's book. Nor is there any theological apology for pruning the collections which bear the names of Amos and Hosea of about one half of their traditional content.

A casual reader may easily adjudge this work irresponsible. The seemingly cavalier manner in which verses are rearranged or dropped entirely will call for serious questioning on the part of some readers. The serious student will find some of his questions answered in an important article published ten years ago by the author. It is in English despite its appearance in a German quarterly (*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 12te Band, 1935, pp. 90-129). To support his emendations and deletions, Professor Wolfe has promised a technical publication intended for Old Testament scholars.

The genuine passages from Amos and Hosea are given in a fresh translation and accompanied by short commentaries. The commentary is factual; yet through the recitation of facts shines a warm enthusiasm for the ideals of these two prophets of Israel. Use has been made of the imagination—but always disciplined by a sense of probability—in reconstructing the situation out of which a particular oracle sprung. The suggestion that Amos was possibly the first prophet martyr of the Hebrew people rests entirely upon supposition. Professor Wolfe is careful to mark these results of his study with the label of supposition.

His scholarly defense of the interpretation of Hosea will be most anxiously awaited. He refutes the almost "universally accepted" error, the assumption that Hosea consciously sought out a harlot and married her. Hosea sought out a wife who was one of the "choice young women of Israel," but when his high expectation for her failed, he saw in the tragedy a parable of Israel. Another misconception, according to Professor Wolfe, is that Hosea rescued Gomer from prostitution and sin. He would reject chapter 3 as secondary, the product of later editors who assumed that Hosea's domestic life paralleled God's dealing with the Hebrew people. Thus the later phase of Hosea's marital life was but a supposed domestic counterpart to the return of Judah from exile. He concludes that Gomer finally met death at the hands of a Palestinian society as a punishment for her sin. The author suggests that Hosea may have died a martyr. This volume will serve a useful purpose in making dramatic the meaning of these two prophets of Israel. It is hoped that Professor Wolfe will continue this series in order to make available to the average reader the fruit of higher criticism upon other prophets of Israel.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

*Method for the Easy Comprehension of History,* by John Bodin, translated by Beatrice Reynolds, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. xxix, 402, $6.

The writer feels abashed in attempting what should be a review of this book, dealing as it does with an age of thought of which he has but slight knowledge. But it has fascinated him with its essay at a philosophy of history, and he may only trust that his interest in the novel book may serve to introduce it to others, so that it may open their eyes as well.

The author (1539-1596) spent his life at Toulouse, seat of a notable university. Ueberweg's *History of Philosophy* (Engl. tr.) gives him only brief notice in two

paragraphs of a few lines apiece. But he speaks of him as follows (Vol. II, pp. 30 f.): "The merit of having vindicated the claim of all religious confessions to political toleration, and having founded the theories of natural law and politics on ethnography and the study of history, belongs especially to Jean Bodin." That writer however does not include in Bodin's bibliography the *Method* of the present volume.

In the first place, high praise should be given to the translator. She took for basis four printed editions of Bodin's book, scattered among three American libraries. Her annotations note the variance of readings, the difficulties and necessary corrections. Of particular value are the notes placing Bodin's constant citations from the Bible (he cites the Hebrew occasionally), the early Greek and Roman writers, those of the Middle Ages, down to the literature of the writer's own time. He cites many writers who might generally be unknown, and the notes inform the reader who they were, what they wrote, and when they lived. The *Introduction* of twenty-nine pages presents a careful survey, with some criticism, of Bodin's philosophy. At the end is given a bibliography of eight pages, followed by a careful index, mostly personal, of fourteen pages. And in particular it is to be noted that the translation is most smooth and excellent.

It is difficult to make a choice out of the writer's many themes, which are all logically arranged. On pp. 25 f. he enumerates the sciences necessary to the student of history, summed up under the term cosmography: uranography (the writer is quite susceptible to astrology), anemography, hydrography, geography. Then he states that the earth is to be divided into four or five zones, with America included, and that these zones are to be studied in particular. Chapter IV deals with "The Choice of Historians," and his criticism of many of them is exact and excellent. There may be noted his true observation (p. 53): "Although many think that the praise of good and the vituperation of evil are among the advantages of history, this service can be performed more truthfully and better by philosophers than by historians." He illustrates his nonpartisan view of history by remarking (p. 82) on "the excellent deeds" of the Apostate Julian, ignored by most historians.

Chapter V, "The Correct Evaluation of Histories," is a discussion of the various types of mankind, distinguished by the various climates, which, cold and warm, dry and wet, affect human character. But these differences are combined in a unity which with profound originality he terms "the republic of the world (pp. 116 f.). Chapter VI discusses the type of government in states. The family is ideally the image of the state. And in consequence we find first judges and the like, then in sequence monarchy, tyranny, the rule of the aristocrats and of the plebs, their failure, and tyranny again. Monarchy, as with the father of the family, is the best form of government, but its success depends upon the monarch's piety, wisdom, and justice. The chapter discusses at length the polity of states and kingdoms down to the author's own day; he has high praise for the Helvetian Commonwealth. Chapter VIII deals with chronology, sets forth its necessity for historians, and explains the reasons for the inexactness of current chronological tables. He considers the theory of recurrent cycles of mathematical equivalence based on the squares and cubes of chronological figures, thus illustrating a philosophy of the day.

Chapter IX, "Criticism by which to Test the Origins of Peoples," may be of particular interest to modern ethnologists and linguists. It insists on the fusion and complication of races, dwells on their constant migrations, so that race and language are merged together, and gives word studies proving this fact. Amusingly the Frenchman takes up argument against the German scholars, who held that the Gauls

and Celts were Teutons—an early case of the rivalry between the two peoples, lasting to the present day.

The true liberalism of the writer appears in various ways. Although a good Christian, he remarks (p. 362) that "none can boast about the antiquity of their origin and the great age of their race except the Jews." And just above he observes how remarkable it is that "from these people flow as from a fountain the religions which are accepted by the whole world." As for varieties of religion, he speaks as follows (p. 25): "First let us collect the chief teachings of each religion. Then let us see who was the author of each; what beginnings, what advances, finally what form and what end it had; what in each is accessory to virtue, what foreign. . . . From this material one may usefully garner many things from which to offer trophies to all-powerful God as did the Hebrews from the loot of the Egyptians"—this simile a true stroke of humor! And in particular there are his open-minded, noncritical notices of the Protestant bodies of the day, which were disrupting the writer's church (pp. 126 f.). He cites Luther, Calvin, Melanchthon without reproach. The translator (p. xxvi) notes his acquaintance with Protestant scholarship. He confesses with sorrow the martyrdom in France of many of those sectarians. And he notes the innumerable varieties of opinion in the German Reformation (p. 127): "They not only followed the teachings of Huss or of Luther, but also of the Anabaptists, of von Leyden, Zwingli, Karlstadt, Osiander, Westphal, David, Stancar, the Adamites, the Waldensians, the Interimists, and almost countless others." He was indeed well up in contemporary religious history. A bit of higher criticism appears in his contention (pp. 83 f.) that the books of Deuteronomy, Judges, Samuel, Kings are composite volumes, a criticism to be applied to all historical writing.

Chapter X is the writer's "Order and Collection of Historians," giving in the course of sixteen pages an account of the historians, their works and subjects, with the *floruit* of each, arranged in chronological order. It gives insight into the amazing bibliographical knowledge of scholars of that age.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

*What Religion Is and Does*, by Horace T. Houf, New York, Harper, 1945 (rev. ed.), pp. viii, 413, $3.

Its predecessor was a good book, and its revision makes its still better. This statement the reviewer attests by his use of it for several years as a prominent reference for reading in his introductory course in religion, and this use will be continued. The revision improves its quality, even if at some points it has not been as complete and thorough as it ought to have been.

This is not to disparage unduly the amount of revising done. It is true that sometimes this has been but a reshuffling of paragraphs, a division of one into two paragraphs (pp. 311 and 313), or a telescoping of two with slight omissions into one (pp. 331 f.). Many paragraphs, however, have been rewritten (*e.g.*, on pp. 32, 34, 74, and 330 f.), and not a few pages are essentially new (*e.g.*, pp. 61, 78, and 364). There are new illustrations (pp. 111 f.), and points at which more recent data have been substituted (statistics in chap. XIX, also pp. 349 f. and 355 f). Chap. IV, "The Ethics of Belief" (XX in the former edition) has been moved much nearer the front, and a new section on our duty to think improves a chapter that would have profited from a more thorough reworking. There is a new section on miracles (pp. 78-82), a new one on humanism (pp. 129-131), another new one on Christianity involved in history (pp. 314-316), and yet other new materials even to that of a new chapter on the religion of the Jews.

Here it is possible that the author applied to himself his observation that "in our

Western World persons too easily tend to mean Christianity when they speak of religion" (p. 66). That pretty well described the original book and, save for this entirely new chapter, is still too apt for this one. Slight efforts are made to bolster up the volume at this point, but they are inadequate. There is one paragraph (pp. 222 f.) on the Old Testament as one of many sacred books. There is another (p. 281) on Jesus as one among other founders of religions. Yet one other paragraph (p. 77) refers to "the field of Comparative Religion" but finally concludes that "its elaboration is not within our present purpose" (p. 77). Why not? the reviewer must ask. Would it not be as relevant to What Religion Is and Does as is many another chapter in this good volume, even in the face of pressing limitations of space? Or does the theme of this work really mean What Christianity Is and Does? This is a weak spot in an otherwise excellent book.

Three minor points on biblical items: 1. "The second document is the 'E,' or Elohist, source (p. 232). The author fails to point out, even in his account of P, that there are two Elohist sources, and so sponsors confusion for the student. Since he is properly featuring the "divine names" used, it would have clarified the situation to have observed that P also uses *Elohim,* and so is to be differentiated by other qualities he here enumerates. 2. There should have been a place in the section, Sources of the Pentateuch, or elsewhere in the chapter for a reference to Hammurabi and his code as a possible source of the Mosaic law. This is all the more true since reference is made to the use of early Babylonian stories (p. 238). 3. Why is there not a more decisive reference to Hebrews (p. 271)? No modern Bible ascribes it to Paul, and where is there a modern scholar who does it?

These criticisms, the reviewer hopes, will not bury the first sentence of this review to the effect that this is a better book than its predecessor. It provides, save at the one point noted, a comprehensive and orderly account of the problems and values of religion. No teacher should overlook its value for an introductory course in religion, and the intelligent layman will find it an excellent guide in his quest for a better understanding of its theme.

IRWIN R. BEILER

*Son of Man and Suffering Servant,* by Edward A. McDowell, Nashville, Broadman, ©1944, pp. 216, $2.

The scope of this book is indicated in the title. Jesus' consciousness concerning himself and his mission was patterned after the higher Old Testament prophetic concept of the Messiah and after the "suffering servant" of Isaiah. Jesus' attitude toward himself and his mission, it is maintained, was consistent from the beginning to the end of his ministry (*vs.* Schweitzer, *et al.*). McDowell supports his position by an exegetical study of sections such as the accounts of the temptation, Jesus' declaration at Nazareth, Cæsarea Philippi, the passion, and the resurrection.

With the author's thesis that Jesus thought of himself as the Messiah and as the "suffering servant," I am in agreement. The claim that Jesus thought of himself as the "suffering servant" from the beginning of his ministry, however, is difficult to substantiate. To take one example: in Luke's account of the declaration at Nazareth, Jesus read from Isaiah 61. McDowell thinks Jesus chose this deliberately, to identify himself with the servant of Jehovah. Although he quotes Delitzsch to support his claim, it should be recognized that not all Old Testament scholars agree that Isaiah 61 refers to the servant. Even if it does, the passage makes no mention of suffering, but centres rather around the proclamation of glad tidings.

As a part of the argument that Jesus was not the apocalyptic son of man, McDowell discusses the "little apocalypse" and takes the position that Jesus, by the "coming," does not refer to the parousia, but to a "coming" which will take place after the destruction of Jerusalem. Otherwise, he contends, Jesus would be "an apocalyptist who erred grievously in his prophecy." It is difficult to see wherein the destruction of Jerusalem effected any change in the church which could be construed as evidence of a "coming." It would seem as much an error to refer this passage to his "coming" in A.D. 70 as to his parousia.

In the discussion of the difficult passage, Luke 17:20 ff., the position is taken that *entos* should be translated "within," not "in the midst." In the final analysis, the interpretation of the passage does not rest on the linguistic argument alone. It is in order, however, to question McDowell's statement that in the latest edition of Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon* there is not a single citation of a classic author who uses *entos* in the sense of "in the midst." They do, however, quote a passage from Xenophon, which Bauer (*Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*) uses as an example for translating *entos* "in the midst."

It is a pity that in a scholarly work the King James version should be used for quotations, even though the author has modified them at points in the light of the original. One wonders, too, why reference is made to Whiston's translation of Josephus, rather than to the translation in the *Loeb Classical Library*.

RUSSELL C. TUCK

*Church History in the Light of the Saints*, by Joseph A. Dunney, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. 465, $2.75.

This is a book of rhetoric. History is sacrificed to impassioned prose and truth to glowing panegyrics. The author evidently was guided by the ancient policy, Why spoil a good story by overscrupulosity concerning facts?

St. Peter, of course, is first, chosen by Christ "the foundation stone of His Church." "An ancient tradition discovers him at length in Antioch, the first bishop of that great city." "To Rome itself, the capital of that vast Empire, St. Peter was destined by Heaven itself to journey" and "Into the Porta Portese, about the year 42 A.D., came the Prince of the Apostles, having made his way over land and sea. . . . Had the elite of the city ventured as far as the Jew-ridden docks they could have rubbed shoulders with the founder of this Empire of Christ. For St. Peter, indistinguishable from any poor countryman in his worn gaberdine, was ever busy about his Master's business. By day and night he moved among the mass of hovels and lodging houses; hour upon hour he spent near the wharves piled up with bales of merchandise."

The story of meeting Jesus carrying his cross as Peter was fleeing from persecution in the imperial city is told with all seriousness. Touched to the quick by the pathos of the Master's rebuke, "I go to Rome to be crucified again for thee," Peter retraced his steps, was cast into prison; but, a "willing captive for Christ, he won over the gaoler whom he baptized from the waters of a miraculous spring which burst out from the dry floor of the dungeon." Finally, at his crucifixion, "he begged his executioners to let him die head downwards, deeming himself unworthy to die in the posture of his Master."

After this we are not surprised to find other extremes of statement—not to say disregard of historical facts. Marcus Aurelius "viewed with pagan alarm the growth of the new religion; cruel and unscrupulous he resolved to destroy it utterly—root, stem and branch. . . . A Stoic to the hard core of his heart, the

Emperor cynically regarded the faith of Christians as outright fanaticism; their superb aplomb before cruel judges only obstinancy; their cheerful acceptance of martyrdom just 'a tragic show!'. . . Nowise deterred by the calamities, earthquake and inundation visiting his domains, nor even by the great plague of 166 from which his Empire never recovered, the Stoic ruler continued to persecute his Christian subjects."

Caught "in the thick of this pagan press" was St. Justin the Martyr. "Was he trembling with fear, would he capitulate? The answer is, no!"

If there is exaggerated praise for the saints, there is, on the other hand, fanatical hatred and condemnation of "the false teachers of the age." Peter Abelard was "easily the most brilliant theological teacher of the twelfth century, though vanity, ill-temper and reckless language marred his genius. . . . His career was lust-spoilt by unfortunate conduct with Heloise, a young girl for whom he had a passionate attachment." The author quotes with approbation the statement of Bernard of Clairvaux: "He neither eats nor drinks, but with the Devil hungers and thirsts after souls."

Though the "Waldenese and Humiliati" were "dangerous and undisciplined fanatics" who "disrupted the peace," the author's bitterest calumny is reserved for the Albigeneses, who, "the vilest of all sects, held hideous doctrines about the family, decried life and encouraged suicide. Once the public wrath was aroused, mobs quickly formed, and massacres followed, fanatical leaders being burned at the stake for threatening the State." Not a word there of the Inquisition!

Of St. Rose of Lima we are told: "Birds nesting near by sang sweetly at her command; trees bowed their heads and touched the ground."

Concerning the Jesuit, Martinez, perhaps the first priest to enter North America, the author favorably quotes Governor Menendez, "Both noble and virtuous, Father Martinez alone would have accomplished more good than can now be achieved by all the soldiers in Florida." But these two were guilty of one of the most horrible massacres in all history, the destruction of the settlement of the French Huguenots at Fort Caroline at the mouth of St. John's river in Florida—an act which Professor Thomas O'Gorman, author of *A History of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States,* terms "an inhuman deed."

R. E. E. HARKNESS

*Tempo and Mode in Evolution,* by George Gaylord Simpson, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. xviii, 237, $3.50.

In recent years renewed interest has developed in the subject of evolution, due, at least in part, to the development of a new subdivision of genetics, population genetics, which permits of an experimental attack in a field which heretofore has been largely based on logical deductions from observable facts. This new book represents a survey of these modern theories by a palæontologist. Accepting and applying the mathematical and experimental analyses of population genetics to palæontological data, the author finds that insofar as the data from the two fields can be compared, palæontological history can be made consistent with interpretation by population genetics. Some of the book is speculative, but the author distinguishes clearly between facts and interpretations and between probable truths and guesses. Unfortunately for the layman, the book seems to be a treatise for specialists. It presupposes considerable familiarity with scientific names, terms, and thought. For ready reading it should be preceded by at least some knowledge of elementary statistics, palæontology, general zoology, genetics, and population genetics. Of course, a serious

novice could read it with profit, but it is not easy reading even for one fairly familiar with the subject.

The author discusses in sequence the rates of evolution, determinants, micro-, macro-, and megaevolution, low rate versus high rate lines, inertia, trends, momentum, the environment, and finally modes. In his last chapter he summarizes his views on evolution through the ages:

"The same general forces are operative throughout the whole of evolution, and they bring about similar processes and sequences wherever and whenever they occur. Their predominance, balance, and interaction do, nevertheless, vary greatly, and quite different sorts of evolutionary patterns may result. These patterns are protean. Their seemingly infinite variety is so bewildering that generalization appears impossible at first. Yet through them all there run three major styles, the basic modes of evolution." These modes he terms speciation, phyletic evolution, and quantum evolution.

*Speciation* is given as the local differentiation of two or more groups *within* a more widespread population following means worked out by population genetics. Speciating is shifting, erratic, not typically either linear or adaptive, and is greatly influenced by the size of the interbreeding population (moderate, not large, size most favorable). *Phyletic evolution* is the term applied to slow, sustained, directional shifts of the average characters of an *entire* population. Phyletic evolution is highly adaptive and is represented by the common palæontological series (*e.g.,* horses). *Quantum evolution* is the term applied to the relatively rapid shift of a population to one or more *new lines.* Quantum evolution involves loss of genetic equilibrium, a preadaptive shift and then establishment of an entirely new equilibrium. Palæontological evidence suggests that quantum evolution accounts for major changes (phyla, etc.) and that these occur rapidly; population genetics offers a possible mechanism. Each of these three modes may occur at any evolutionary level and may occur in combination, but the tendency is for lower taxonomic categories (species, etc.) to arise by speciation, intermediate categories by phyletic evolution (genera, families, etc.), and higher categories by quantum evolution (phyla).

The evidence presented is cogent and the book one to be recommended as presenting material and ideas not available elsewhere. A. GLENN RICHARDS, JR.

*Humanism and Human Dignity*, by Luther Winfield Stalnaker, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1945, pp. 58, $1.

In the author's words, stated near the close of this thirteenth of the Yale *Studies in Religion,* its aim is "to reveal the Absolutists' denial of the ultimate significance of time, evil, and freedom as inconsistent with their own fundamental premises; and, positively, to reveal them, if consistent, as being under obligation to accept the Humanistic position on those issues" (p. 52). Bradley, Bosanquet, and Royce are chosen as representatives of absolutism. In the three chapters on time, evil, and freedom, relevant and revealing passages are selected from these three men which show the sense in which each denies the metaphysical ultimacy of the three basic concepts, and other excellent passages on the concrete *appearance* of these three aspects of experience are ably and persuasively argued by the author to imply that time, evil, and freedom are metaphysically real.

The author's humanism is said to be in the tradition of James and Schiller. It is not set in antithesis to theism but to the absolutism of the Hegelian tradition which the three men under consideration incorporate with different individual emphases and variations. In this absolutism, the author claims, is found "the ulti-

mate totalitarianism" which is "philosophical and religious" (p. 1). The interest of the author, if not the aim of the essay, appears here as the "vindication of human personality" in a "day when the smothering fumes of world devastation obscure the meaning and destiny of human living" (p. 1). But no argument is made to show this totalitarian implication of Hegelian absolutism; and no distinction is made or implied between such philosophical absolutism, on the one hand, which *logically* need not imply *authoritarian* absolutism, whatever its actual human consequences may be, and, on the other hand, the authoritarian and clearly totalitarian "absolutism" of contemporary Neo-Thomism which both explicitly and by implication subordinates critical philosophical and scientific examination of certain basic questions to divine "truth" as "authoritatively" decided by the "authoritative" hierarchy of a religious institution.

If we grant, as I think we should, that the *systems* of Bradley, Bosanquet, and Royce, as well as Hegelianism generally, stand condemned today, there remains an interesting, if not important, philosophical issue between some forms of pragmatic humanism and the novel "idealism" of Whitehead. The neglect of this issue in an essay on idealism which appears to intend to enlighten current controversies is somewhat peculiar in view of the strong claim made for Whitehead's philosophy by such a distinguished absolute idealist as R. F. Alfred Hoernlé who associates "The *Revival* of Idealism in the United States" with Whitehead, (*Contemporary Idealism in America,* edited by Clifford Barrett, Chap. XII, my emphasis).

In a time when critical consideration of our traditions and analysis of the social consequences of basic beliefs are of tragic importance, it is something of a reflection on our academic habits and on our grasp of anthropological principles, even though perhaps it is a compliment to our faltering democratic liberties, that our attention can be claimed by a study on religion which, outside the introductory paragraph, says nothing about such consequences or about the conflicts in our tradition which threaten to submerge freedom in something far more substantial than the particular metaphysical concepts of Hegel and his disciples.

HORACE S. FRIES

*The Preacher's Voice,* by William C. Craig and Ralph R. Sokolowsky, Columbus, Wartburg Press, 1945, pp. 132, $2.

Here at last is a presentation of the minister's voice problem at once thoroughly competent in technical principles and informed by a sympathetic and intelligent anticipation of the questions every minister raises—or, at least, should raise—about his own vocal effectiveness. The late Dr. Sokolowsky had been one of the leading phoniatrists of Europe before coming to this country; Professor Craig combines scholarship in the field of speech with practical experience gleaned while teaching at the Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, before going to Wooster College. The scope of the volume may be indicated most easily by the chapter headings: "The Preacher and His Voice," "The Mechanics of the Voice," "Common Ills of the Preacher's Voice," "The Hygiene of the Preacher's Voice," "Special Voice Training," "The Delivery of the Sermon," and "The Interpretative Reading of the Scriptures."

The preacher without technical training will find the chapters on common ills, hygiene, and special training especially valuable. Here such common faults and ailments as nasality, glottal-shock, and "clergyman's sore throat" are discussed in their symptoms, causes, prevention, and correction. While the chapter on voice mechanics may go farther into matters of physiology than serves the interest of the uninitiated, the book throughout employs language concise and clear, and readily intelligible. The drills recommended in the chapter on special training combine simplicity and

utility with sound phonetic principles. The last two chapters on sermon delivery and the reading of the scriptures do not attempt an exhaustive discussion of these subjects, but in a brief way apply to these endeavors the vocal usages developed in the preceding chapters.

The only limitation in the book is one imposed by the nature of speech training, and one which the authors would be first, no doubt, to recognize, that is, that the preacher should not expect to solve all his voice problems simply by reading this text. He must practice "assiduously" the drills and exercises; and he will need, now and again, the assistance of a competent instructor, in order to make sure that he actually achieves the proper use of the voice mechanism, and produces the desired result, lest his own ear and his kinesthetic sense deceive him into faulty practice. But all that can be done by a well-constructed, well-written manual for his guidance has been realized in this volume.

JOHN L. CASTEEL

*According to Paul*, by Harris Franklin Rall. New York, Scribner, 1944, pp. xv, 272, $2.75.

Here is a real book. Its object is to answer two questions: What is Christianity according to Paul? Are his conclusions valid for our day? In all sobriety and restraint it may be said that he answers both magnificently. Despite the fact that Dr. Rall is a systematic theologian—and has been for thirty years—and therefore not unnaturally finds his supreme interest in the second question, I was never conscious, as I read with delight his pages, that he had slurred over or compromised in the slightest with the all-important prior question. Instead, he has presented a superbly fair and balanced Paul—a Paul of the first century, not of the twentieth. At many points Paul was a man of his day; thus at such points we cannot always follow him. With scrupulous fairness again and again Rall makes this clear, and with no resultant loss to Paul's stature. Rather the thoughtful reader, whatever be his technical competence, can scarcely fail to see, and vividly, the justice of Rall's contention: Paul has shaped the thinking of the Christian church more than any other one man. He is able to differentiate between what Paul said on certain crucial matters and the subsequent systems built upon him, and he warns against the too common tendency—which he conspicuously does not share—to convert Paul's illustrations which are often daringly vivid, at times dangerously so, into doctrines.

There are many points which I should like to rehearse, simply to commend the sobriety and insight of this man who is a competent biblical theologian because he is also a competent historian. Among these would surely be his treatment of Christ and man's salvation, with the warning against isolating Christ's death from his total work. Another would be the admirable discussion of Paul's so-called mysticism, and the clear-cut distinction between classic (God-centred) mysticism of which there is no shred in Paul and the very different Christ-mysticism. Another would be the sensible words about the nature of sin; that in Paul sin is far from being an equivalent to flesh, that the reason that man sins is not that he is fettered to a sinful body. Another point of significance is his very simple but cogent series of word studies: grace, faith, church, love, all discussed with acumen and sobriety.

The volume is the outgrowth of four lectures delivered in 1942 on the Ayer Foundation at Colgate-Rochester. The author modestly suggests that the volume is not intended for the specialist, whether in New Testament or theology. But I cordially recommend it to both with the assurance that they, together with the layman for whom it is intended, will find it of distinct moment.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

# BOOK NOTICES

*Problems of New Testament Translation,* by Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, ©1945, pp. xix, 215, $2.50.

This is a very important volume for the preacher. It would be possible to characterize it as 115 examples of the superiority of Goodspeed's translations of the New Testament to the King James. It is that, but it is much more. Dr. Goodspeed takes the reader into his workshop and not only lets him look around but explains what it is all about. The opening essay, "A Hundred Translation Problems," should be compulsory reading for all who presume to talk about the comparative merits of the King James and modern translations. After reading it, there are some things which no man who has the slightest tincture of intelligence will ever say again. Then he is ready for the personally conducted short tour through the pages of the New Testament, whereby not only are the many and different types of problem skillfully exhibited but the way in which the various translators sought to meet them set forth. Dr. Goodspeed's method is to cite at the beginning of each of these charming little essays the reading of the King James; then follows a discussion of how that reading was reached—for the King James was no new translation but a very restrained revision of the Bishops' Bible, but indebted also to no less than seven other predecessors: Tyndale, Coverdale, Rogers, Taverner, the Great, Geneva, and the Rheims. Then the various solutions offered by private translators are considered. And again the reader who thinks that the only translators to attempt a different rendering than that of the days of King James have been the American Revision, Moffatt, and Goodspeed will find his ignorance pleasantly and profitably dispelled. At the end of each essay Goodspeed appends his own suggestion. And I shall be surprised if many readers do not feel a deal more kindly disposed to these latter after having seen their genesis than they did when they found them unexplained in the *American Translation.* In addition, he will acquire a good many bits of useful information not only about other translations but about the King James itself. He may even be a bit startled to find that this latter has been constantly, if quietly, revised and reëdited through the years, with the result that the present text of that masterpiece is very different from what it was when Miles Smith wrote the preface. Thus, to cite but a few examples, he will be interested in know, that *Moyses, Hierusalem, Isahac, Mariæ, fornace, charet, murther, damosel, fift, sixt, moe, fet, creeple, moneth* all stood there originally, but have been gradually replaced. He will perhaps be glad to point these facts out to those of his congregation who still consider the diction of the King James the language of heaven. And these passages, chosen with great skill, illustrate the whole gamut of problems which a translator has to face. It is a book to keep on one's desk and to consult whenever a text is to be subjected to homiletic exercise.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

*Your Problem—Can It Be Solved?* by Dwight J. Bradley, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. vi, 213, $2.

*Your Problem—Can It Be Solved?* is a sensible and, if rightly interpreted, a helpful discussion of the difficult situations that confront men and women and that we describe as problems. Life means not only the continuous struggle for physical existence of which the biologists talk, but also a frequent facing of the decision-

demanding conflicts which perplex and at times disturb each of us. It is the more serious type of problem that the author deals with, and for the purpose of bringing insight. He recognizes the complexity of the inward contentions but attempts to turn the reader to the more practical question: what is to be done? The book includes a question-answer analysis of six typical problems in the effort to bring insight rather than to present a pattern of proper procedure. The author both in his diagnosis and treatment places the problems discussed within a religious framework and counts upon an unemotional, self-searching approach to them on the part of the individual in trouble. When this is true, any problem is half-solved, for the core of our most violent upheavals consists of an unrealized self-deception, the dislodging of which is seldom in the power of the individual in trouble. *Your Problem—Can It Be Solved?* is a splendid first-aid resource for those whose disturbances are of the type that can be dealt with without the surgery of the scientific specialist, and if the reader keeps this in mind, he will find the book useful for its suggestions and interpretations.

ERNEST R. GROVES

*The Bible Speaks to Our Day,* by George Barclay, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1945, pp. 93, $1.

Into these ninety-three pages is packed a wealth of ripe scholarship, sound interpretation, keen spiritual insight, excellent homiletics. The homiletic skill deserves mention, for here is no mere essay or dissertation. Seven straight, attention-gripping lectures or sermons are given to the larger public. The author goes to the heart of some twenty biblical passages to find the essential principles involved. Then he applies these principles piercingly to the situations of his own day. Each lecture is impressive and carries the vigor of a man whose soul is enlisted in a great cause. Notable is the chapter on Isaiah and the Hitler of his day. Almost like an Isaiah refrain comes the repeated "The last word is with God." These lectures bring no superficial use of catch phrases to characterize men or events today. They show careful study of historical situations, faithful grappling with the meaning of books of the Bible, crisp statements of main truths, deep meditation on their significance for individuals and for nations. Like the loyal Briton that he is, the author believes that the triumph of the United Nations is necessary for exhibition of the justice of God. Yet he is equally convinced that the same justice must demand heart searching and amendment among the victors. He refrains from giving specific points in regard to Britain's allies, but has no question that all share the need for penitence and reform, even if they are not to be charged with the excesses of the aggressor nations. V-E Day may have blunted our appreciation of the dogged British faith and pluck that held through the dark hours. But very pertinent still are the echoes of the prophetic calls to execute justice, love mercy, and walk humbly with God. Most timely are the expositions of New Testament passages to get their lessons for postwar reconstruction problems. Convincingly the author urges that the great need for securing a better world is better men and women. Faithfully he sets forth the realization of the great purpose of God in Christ, the witness of the church to that purpose, and the contribution which the church alone can make to the new order. Dr. Barclay supports his thought with several apt quotations. Many of his own pithy phrases are so quotable that one rebels at the copyright law. Little in size, the book is mighty in its Christian impact. Its reading is richly rewarding.

W. N. DONOVAN

*Paul for Everyone,* by Charles Warren Quimby, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. xv, 176, $2.

The title indicates the purpose, scope, and style of this book: a condensed summary of the apostle's personality, life, letters, and ideas, all on an introductory level. The author seeks completeness, vividness, and simplicity. Scholars will feel that he achieves completeness only at the expense of sketchiness; readers with literary taste may find that the effort for vivid idiom involves the author in a journalistic jargon that is both trite and incongruous; theologians may conclude that Paul's ideas have been simplified almost to the point of parody. Yet these criticisms are almost inevitable whenever an author undertakes a popular, edifying introduction to a saint. As an introduction, this study is better than most. Readers should remember, however, that few introductions in themselves, whether in social gatherings or in books, enable one to penetrate to the deeper levels of personal dialogue where one person shares with another his agonies and triumphs. How many people we meet! How few we know!

PAUL S. MINEAR

*They Found the Church There,* by Henry P. Van Dusen, New York, Scribner, 1945, pp. xii, 148, $1.75.

*They Found the Church There* is a description of a new kind of "Laymen's Inquiry" into foreign missions. "It embraces the whole world. It is fortuitous, not carefully organized. It is being conducted . . . by hard-bitten soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the armed forces of the United Nations . . . . Instances of complete 'about face' from indifference, skepticism, or derision to ardent enthusiasm pile up by the hundreds." From personal experience and with enough historical background to relate his presentation to the whole missionary movement, Dr. Van Dusen sets forth the firsthand observations of officers and G.I.'s who have seen the church at work in New Guinea, the Solomons, Micronesia, at the "rear commands," and in such diverse lands as India and Alaska. These men describe missions as they actually saw them. In the bush or in humming cities, they found Christians of many races, worshiping God, living clean lives, and eager to help these servicemen of the Allied Nations. Senator James M. Meade reported: "American doughboys are reaping heavily where the missionaries have so long and patiently sown." A major in the American Army summarized his appraisal: "The best cure I can think for atheism would be a few days spent with the missionaries here—and incidentally the best example of Church unity one could ask for is provided by the Protestant Church here. The Protestant denominations in this country simply call themselves 'The Church of Christ in Africa.' If more of our people at home could see this work at firsthand you would never again have difficulty in raising funds for foreign missions." Here is the story of almost unbelievable achievement, not only of devoted American and European missionaries, but perhaps even more of the native Christians in the extension of the church. This is a book that thrills us with accomplishment and challenges our own faith.

JOSEPH CHANDLER ROBBINS

*Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work,* edited by Edwin Eells, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, pp. x, 492, $5.

Forty-five "selected papers," contributed by fifty-two authors, have been chosen by an editorial committee as the *Proceedings* of a national conference held under various wartime restrictions. A comparison of the table of contents with the program, printed as "Appendix A," indicates that much labor was expended to give

the book reader interest. The Conference had the usual sections on case work, group work, community organization, social action, and public welfare administration. There are ten titillative topics, of which the following are examples: "Social Work Resets Its Sights," "We Look Ahead," and "We Examine Our Services to the War's Fighters and Producers." The attempt in recent years to make these annual publications more readable should have been carried to the point of bestowing a real title on this volume. The stated purpose of the Conference contains a suggestion: how social work may "contribute its utmost to winning the war—and establishing a just and lasting peace." With a few exceptions, notably Max Lerner, of *PM,* and Senator James E. Murray, the contributors are leaders in social work. The volume is a rich source of information on war services, trends in social security, and social planning schemes. There is evidence of a continuing drive toward integration of the social services, uniformity of techniques, and increase of tax support. In light of these trends it is rather surprising that less than half of the contributors represent governmental agencies. Alert representatives of the older professions may note the impact of social work upon their customary functions. The 1944 *Proceedings* merits careful study before it is shelved beside its sister volumes.

RAYMOND L. HIGHTOWER

*Beyond Personality,* by C. S. Lewis, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. vii, 68, $1.

Readers of previous volumes by C. S. Lewis know his interesting style and his captivating methods. *Beyond Personality* follows *The Case for Christianity;* the latter told why the Christian belief is true, the former describes what this Christian belief actually is. If you begin with the propositions of Lewis, you have no difficulty in following his procedure. The Christian belief is made clear and plausible, even credible. But if you do not so begin, it is doubtful whether you will be converted. The analogies, beyond the fact that no analogy ever goes on all fours, are not quite convincing. Not only the skeptic, but also the sincere and honest questioner, feels that somewhere in the discussion an extra assumption has been slipped in—like the rabbit that mysteriously appears from the magician's hat. He makes it evident—but not clear! These books make good radio listening, but they are not good classroom lectures, where students can talk back! The last four chapters are the best, for the reason that Lewis is a better moralist than a theologian. Let him write more *Screwtape Letters* and *Out of the Silent Planet* books, where his philosophy and theology are subservient to literature, for he is not at his best when the reverse is true.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

*The Radiant Life,* by Rufus M. Jones, New York, Macmillan, 1944, pp. viii, 144, $2.

This volume, by the dean of American mysticism, represents Rufus Jones at his mellow best. It contains his Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality, "The Spell of Immortality," given at Harvard University, and other lectures and addresses; but most of the chapters are meditations on the great spiritual issues of life, done with penetration and quiet, sure discernment. Preachers will want to read the book for its very real homiletical values; but laymen and preachers alike will come away from reading it with their consciences quickened and with "new eyes for invisibles"—to use a phrase which is Dr. Jones' very own. Some of the chapter titles will indicate their centent: "The Progress of the Soul," "Authentic Tidings," "The Eternal Significance of Life," "The New Sky-Line," "Children of the Light."

EUGENE M. AUSTIN

# BOOKS RECEIVED

**Union Policy and Incentive Wage Methods,* by Van Dusen Kennedy, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. 260, $3.

*New Testament Commentary,* by George M. Lamsa, Philadelphia, Holman, 1945, pp. xvii, 630, $3.75.

A series of comments upon various verses from Acts through Revelation intended to supplement the author's *Gospel Light.* It carries the caption, "From the Aramaic and the Ancient Eastern Customs." Critically useless.

**Hello, Man,* by Kenneth L. Patton, Boston, Beacon, 1945, pp. 114, $1.

**The Appeal to Immediate Experience,* by Robert D. Mack, New York, King's Crown, 1945, pp. 86, $1.25.

**Plainville, U.S.A.,* by James West, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. xviii, 238, $2.75.

**The Gospel of Redemption,* by Walter T. Conner, Nashville, Broadman, ©1945, pp. 369, $3.

**Pastoral Work,* by Andrew W. Blackwood, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1945, pp. 252, $2.

**Pascal: Genius in the Light of Scripture,* by Emile Cailliet, Philadelphia, Westminster, ©1945, pp. 383, $3.75.

**Prophecy and the Church,* by Oswald T. Allis, Philadelphia, Presbyterian and Reformed, 1945, pp. ix, 339, $2.50.

**The Authoritarian Attempt to Capture Education: Papers from the Second Conference on the Scientific Spirit and the Democratic Faith,* New York, King's Crown, 1945, pp. x, 152, $2.50.

**The Covenant Idea in New England Theology,* by Peter Y. De Jong, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1945, pp. 264, $2.50.

**Clinical Pastoral Training,* edited by Seward Hiltner, New York, Commission on Religion and Health (F.C.C.C.A.), 1945, pp. xv, 176, $1.

**The Faith of Man Speaks,* edited by Helen Woodbury, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. 133, $1.75.

**The Lord's Supper in Protestantism,* by Elmer S. Freeman, New York, Macmillan, 1945, pp. xvii, 174, $1.75.

*A Book About the Bible,* by George Stimpson, New York, Harper, ©1945, pp. x, 509, $3.50.

An interesting volume intended to answer many of the questions which have long puzzled readers of the Bible. The author is "an experienced Washington correspondent with a national reputation for collecting and verifying unusual and interesting information."

*Hymns of Divine Reliance,* by Isabel Hicks Gassett, Boston, Bruce Humphries, ©1944, pp. 55, $1.

Forty-two new poems set to music and aiming at the "songful expression of universal truth."

**History of Photography,* by Josef Maria Eder, translated by Edward Epstean, New York, Columbia University Press, 1945, pp. xx, 860, $10.

**Experience Worketh Hope,* by Arthur John Gossip, New York, Scribner, 1945, pp. 200, $2.

**The Church and the Returning Soldier,* by Roy A. Burkhart, New York, Harper, ©1945, pp. xiii, 204, $2.

* To be reviewed.